

1137.2.3

THE
COMMONWEALTH
IN
DANGER;
WITH
AN INTRODUCTION,

CONTAINING
REMARKS on some late WRITINGS of
ARTHUR YOUNG, Esq.

BY JOHN CARTWRIGHT, Esq.

"To be, or not to be, that is the question."

Shakspeare.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. JOHNSON, No. 72, ST. PAUL'S
CHURCH-YARD.

1795.

39.
2. 8.
27.



1007-2-3

ADVERTISEMENT.

CONSIDERING how much political and moral blame is imputed to me, in the book on which I have animadverted in my Introduction, it may be asked, why I remained so long silent. My silence has proceeded from different causes; of which accident was one. I never saw the book in question until I bought it at the publisher's on the 8th of November, 1794; nor did I, till then, know that it contained a syllable in which I was personally concerned. I had ordered the book many months before, together with *Peace and Reform*, which I understood to be in answer to it. The former being then out of print, the latter was laid upon my study table, with the leaves uncut, where it lies to this hour in the same state; as I thought it only common candor to the prior author, to give him the prior reading.

When, indeed, I came to read *The Example of France a Warning to Britain*, I then perceived that I had before seen part of its contents, in the *Annals of Agriculture*, more than two years before; and a part in which my own writings were censured with some severity. That severity at the time did not move me so far as to make me interrupt the occupations of farming, for those of political controversy. Although I pretend not to have been indifferent to the imputations cast upon me, I confided in the truth of the principles I had maintained, and in the evidence of my own right intentions, to justify me in the opinions of all men truly attached to the cause of morality and human happiness; and I wished nothing more, than that every man in this country would guard against being misled by any thing written on either side of the questions I had discussed, by seriously and conscientiously investigating them for himself,

In a letter on subjects of rural œconomy, which I had occasion to write to the author of the *Annals of Agriculture* some time after the publication of the paper alluded to, I
noticed

ADVERTISEMENT.

noticed in general terms the attack he had made upon me; expressed some surprise at the inconsistency of his own conduct; and intimated that as soon as I discovered the error of those opinions, I had obtruded on the world, I should hold myself bound publicly to retract them.

From the foregoing circumstances, it will appear that I did not busy myself very much with what was passing on the political theatre; as well as that I was easily enough diverted, even from getting into my possession a pamphlet which had been widely circulated, and had, as I understood, attracted much attention: and, had I not been called to town as a witness on the late State Trials, it is possible that the constant occupations of my farm might have still longer diverted my attention, and kept me ignorant of the contents of a book, which will not, by any person capable of reflection, be read with indifference.

I certainly read it at last with great advantage, for it was after the enormous mass of evidence for the prosecution, on the trial of *Thomas Hardy*, was closed; when I found the proceedings in that cause, and the doctrines in the pamphlet to illustrate each other in no small degree; leaving me satisfied that they were in fact links of the same chain forged for British Liberty;—the distant parts of a connected plan, forming a deep and daring conspiracy against the constitution. Although the decisions of three immortal juries have stamped this conspiracy with merited infamy, the conspiracy still exists in all the vigour of mischief; and its all pervading influence is felt in whatever concerns the public; and is found to affect the very means of discussing with effect every political question of importance that can arise amongst us. After composing the following Essay, it was a sense of this influence, far more than of any prejudice I had to encounter from a misrepresentation of my own writings, which induced me to write an Introduction.

INTRODUCTION.

IT is the fate of most writers in the cause of human liberty to have far more trouble in undoing what has been done by its enemies, than in laying the solid foundations, and rearing the simple superstructures necessary to the preservation of freedom. In this pleasant part of the task, the works of former architects, and the experience of nations, leave them perhaps nothing to invent and little to introduce, as adapted to their own country and their own time, which has not been stamped by the approbation of wise and good men, or more or less been known to, and practised by, their countrymen. But when an adversary, cunning in his disgraceful calling, hath heaped upon the prepared materials of the builder, rubbish of every kind, till scarcely a vestige of them can be seen; and hath made the ground whereon the builder is to work, the filthy receptacle of unclean things and a chaotic scene of confusion, it requires some industry and some patience in the architect to rear his fabric and to clear the ground; so that it may be seen to advantage, approached with ease, and occupied with security and pleasure. When the writer of the fol-

lowing Essay, thus incommoded, had patiently finished the little Saxon fabric now presented to the public, he found that if he wished it to be seen to advantage, and approached with satisfaction, his work was but half done.

The adversary, biaſſed a little, as it may naturally be ſuppoſed, by his ſituation, as principal bailiff to thoſe who have taken the agriculture of the whole kingdom into their care, had piled up juſt under the architect's noſe, and on every ſide around, vaſt piles of compoſt, of ſo corrupt a compoſition, and ſo offenſive a *haut gout*, that until the day of removal ſhould arrive, it were in vain to expect "*the mountain nymph, ſweet Liberty*" would enter the manſion prepared, or rather repaired for her reception. The architect thinks it peculiarly happy that his adversary adopted *this* ſpecies of obſtruction; for although the temporary dirt and ſtink of a compoſt ſtuffed with the moſt loathſome and diſguſting materials, in which are to be numbered guts and garbage,* the night-ſoil of the inquiſition,† the rank ordure of deſpotiſm,‡ the carcaſſes of ſlaughtered citizens§ in myriads, and the whole well drenched in human gore;|| forbid us for a

* *Example of France a Warning to Britain.* By Arthur Young, Eſq. Secretary to the Board of Agriculture, p. 197.

† *Ib.* 256.

‡ *Ib.* 134.

§ *Ib.* 24.

War! War! War! the burthen of the ſong.

short season to walk in cleanliness, or to breath an uninfected air, yet, as soon as we can disperse the compost in all directions, and scatter it abroad throughout the land, in which the great agriculturist shall have the architect's assistance; at the same time that the former's object of *dispersion*, shall be thus answered; that *removal*, that *abatement of the nuisance*, which is the end of the latter, will be obtained; the mansion of the nymph will be freed from defilement; and the whole land of liberty, benefitted by so prolific a top-dressing, with renewed verdure shall bloom and smile around; the political atmosphere recover its balmy sweetness and its bracing tone; and a rich harvest of freedom reward the labours of the happy husbandmen. How wonderful, how benignant the ways of Providence—ordaining that through a *fermentative process*, resolving matter into its *first principles*, its *elementary particles*, things offensive, loathsome, and even pestilential, become *regenerants* of what is nutritive, wholesome and lovely.

When a man of genius, literature, and a well-earned reputation,—a reputation built on a life spent in an union of scientific and patriotic labours, suddenly descends from such an elevation, and ceases to oppose the enemies of truth and freedom, by developing *principles*; to discountenance false and pernicious practice, by unfolding the salutary dictates

dictates of just *theory*; and to resist the unhallowed attempts of political depravity towards establishing arbitrary sway, by manly reasoning and virtuous *reform*; the understandings of the intelligent must be bewildered: but when the descent of such a man is so low, so extreme, so astonishing, that he becomes the disgraced disseminator of court delusions the most contemptible; the fabricator of false alarms, to serve the dangerous purposes of a domineering faction; and the very personification of political apostacy; the feelings of every moral mind must suffer shame and affliction.

I cannot—I will not, attribute a change so extraordinary, to the corruption of the heart. That could not have been the weak, the vulnerable part, where he was assailed by the great masters of seduction. As gold resists *aqua-fortis*, but dissolves in *aqua-regia*; so there are minds which can resist gold, but dissolve in the fumes of incense. The sturdy farmer of Bradfield, I doubt not, held fast the portal of integrity; but I suspect that his other and dearer self, the F. R. S. the author of a library of agriculture and politics; the honorary member of more than half the philosophical, literary, oeconomic, physical and agricultural societies of Europe; and the man selected to be the *primum mobile* of a new Board in England, the darling child of his own brain, and the object of an anxiety swallowing

INTRODUCTION.

swallowing up all other considerations; unguardedly suffered the wicket of vanity to be opened, and the silent, insinuating, serpent-like weazle of influence to slip in. But when once such vermin has found an entrance,—whether through the portal or through the wicket, it matters not;—the devastation within, of consistency, of honour, of reputation, is much the same.—It is maintained by moralists, that folly and all vice proceeds from a wrong estimate of good; consequently mere error; and that the best mode of recovering from moral error, is for a man to look *within*, and to hold serious *conversation with himself*. In order that Mr. Young may have an opportunity of so doing, I will endeavour to bring him and himself together. Being at present very ill able to spare the necessary time, I am sensible that I shall not perform the office with justice to the object of it; and as I am abridged in time, it is fortunate that I am also absent from my books; so that I cannot have recourse to all I might be tempted to look into. The *Travels* published by Mr. Young in May 1792, is a work of information, genius, taste and patriotism, from which alone its author might have derived no inferior fame; and have endeared his name to the end of time, to every friend of the plough, and of humanity. But how, alas! shall I characterise another work, treading on the very heels of

the former,* and exhibiting its author in a point of view most strangely new, and in many respects the very reverse of his former self?

In the *Travels*, written partly in France, a little before and during the early part of the Revolution, we have sagacious political observation, sound reasoning, temperate and *charitable* discussion; we have abstract principles, and theory, and reform; we have animated appeals to the heart in favour of freedom, and an indignant reprobation of despotism; sometimes, indeed, sallies of passion, and flashes of fire; but it was the passion of an ardent mind, the fire of nature and of *Arthur Young*.—In the *Court Pamphlet*, what others may discern I know not, but scarcely a trace can I see of *Arthur Young*, except the irascibility of his temper, and the fluent gall of his pen: a pen which, while the hand that held it held fast its independence, could well dissect impolitic or iniquitous law; could forcibly inculcate the abstruse maxims of political œconomy; and vigorously delineate and recommend new systems of national conduct;—but which, when become the wretched instrument of

* From what occurs in p. 565 of the *Travels* (1st Edition) that work could not have appeared before May 1792; and the first part of the *Example of France a Warning to Britain* appeared in the *Annals of Agriculture*, No. 104, published at the commencement of September, 1792.

ministers in the unmanly cause of delusion, lost almost every faculty but that of creating confusion by shallow sophistries dictatorially pronounced; and spreading alarm amongst the weak-minded, by hobgoblin absurdities, asserted with a strange mixture of affected terror, vehemence and fury. It is not a new observation, that extravagance in his new calling is as necessary to the apostate, as smiles are to the aching-hearted harlot, or sanctity and zeal to the faintly impostor. Had *The Example of France a Warning to Britain* been the production of an anonymous garretteer, its want of argument and contempt of principle, its malignant calumny and anti-constitutional dogmatism would have caused no wonder: the intelligent and moral reader would have felt only an indignant contempt: but when a gentleman, a man of character, one who has stood high in the republic of letters, sets his name to such a performance; a stroke is given by which virtue herself is wounded; the reader's blood first rushes to his stricken heart; and thence, by revulsion, flies to his cheek, in a blush for human nature. When the ministers of a great country, who have almost reduced to a shadow even parliamentary opposition, pretend to have fears for the public, from a handful of private men of good character aiming at reforms essential to freedom, acting openly, and publishing their proceedings in newspapers; there is in such

an unnatural pretence something portentous; and some deep and atrocious design against the public liberty may rationally be expected. As a *preparative* for legal attack, it is necessary to such ministers that in the public mind, including the minds of the future juries, the cause of these men should if possible be brought into distaste or contempt; their intentions misrepresented, their characters destroyed; and their names made objects of detestation and abhorrence.* And who do we find so industrious as Mr. *Young*, in beating on the hollow drum of delusion this scandalous preparative! Who has so loudly blown the trumpet of civil discord, or rung so unceasingly the treacherous bell of false alarm! But having thus sketched outlines of Mr. *Young*'s two characters as a political author, he shall now speak for himself; but I will endeavour not to treat him as he has treated the writer of this Essay; whose words (*for the purpose of crimination, and of holding him up as a fit object for the severities of an Attorney General*†) he has so culled,

* *Example of France a Warning to Britain*, p. 191.

† This Law Officer in his Reply, on the trial of Mr. *Horne Tooke*, was pleased to observe, and with no small emphasis, that *Major Cartwright* was deeply implicated in the proceedings of the Society for Constitutional Information in the spring of 1792. It is most true; as the Newspapers of that time had already made known to the public. And while the Representation of Englishmen in the House of Commons shall continue in its present mangled

culled, so transposed, so coupled together, and so quoted, that no grammarian on earth could draw from them the meaning of their original author.

As

mangled and melancholy state, and there shall remain but three men in this country so virtuous as to contend for its Reform, I will associate with those men, and raise my voice in that honest cause.

When in my evidence I said, that I had signed many petitions for a reform of Parliament, in company with those whom I thought bad men, and that there was no man so bad with whom I would not sign a petition for obtaining that object, it drew from the Bench an observation; that "it might be a very sincere declaration, but was not a very prudent one; because by connecting myself with bad men, I could never be sure that I might not be carried far beyond my own purpose."—To this observation I made no reply in Court; but I have now to remark, that I did not appear there as a witness, upon my oath, to exhibit my prudence by any prevarication, but to speak truth. As the matter had originated in my having been asked, if I would get into the stage-coach of Reform, without regarding the company that might happen to be in the coach, or to that effect; I must also remark, that he who has a necessary journey to make, and no means but a stage-coach, has not the choice of his company. Conceiving a reform in the House of Commons to be necessary to preserve the liberties of my country, I am not likely to refuse the assistance of any man, in such moral means as I choose myself to adopt for that end. A man may travel in a stage-coach without *connecting himself with bad men* who may at the same time be passengers; as he may sign petitions at public meetings without *connecting himself* with others who attend. I served many years for the defence of my country in the militia, *associated* with what Mr. Young calls *the dregs of the people* (p. 140) since the regiment was in a great de-

gree

As nearly as my materials will allow me, I will bring forward my observations under the following arrangement: viz. 1st, Mr. *Young's* attack on myself.

2d. Mr. *Young's* mode of refuting *Paine*.

3d. Mr. *Young's* fluent and ingenious rage against Personal Representation, Reform, Reformers, and the French Revolution.

4th. Mr. *Young's* ideas on the use and benefit of Associations.

It would be a disgusting piece of drudgery to follow Mr. *Young* through all his crooked perver-

gree composed of hired substitutes; and I have also fought the enemies of *England* at sea, associated even with the very worst men to be found in the night cellars of *London* and *felans from Newgate*; of whom I remember one man in particular—*Nichols*, who murdered a woman, then murdered Colman, by charging him with the first murder and swearing away his life;—then impeached and swore away the lives of his accomplices, whom he also drove to execution, and by being evidence for the crown obtained his pardon.—If Government oblige gentlemen to take the assistance of such men in defending their country, it need not be offended, that gentlemen should join in saving that country, by joining in moral acts with men with whom they are not personally acquainted. If conduct can manifest intention—those who so unreservedly commit themselves to persons whom they do not know, must stand unsuspected of doing what they fear to have reported.

sions

sions and well-managed misrepresentations. Every one knows how easy it is in the compass of a few lines, so to misquote and misapply a writer's words, for the purpose of making them express sentiments foreign to his heart, and contrary to his own application of them; as to lay on the injured person a necessity of filling many pages, ere he can expose the imposition to the satisfaction of the impartial. If therefore I bring forward only a few clear proofs of gross misrepresentation, the reader probably will wish to be spared the examination of all that might be produced.

SECTION 1.

Mr. Young's attack on myself.

Mr. Young after quoting a newspaper for certain speeches delivered in October and December 1792, and January 1793; by some persons in the French Convention, descriptive of the anarchy, the proscriptions, the massacre and murder, then afflicting France, proceeds thus; "These are the accounts
" and the words of the members of the Convention
" openly delivered; but we have a reformer in
" *England*, who characterizes the French Govern-
" ment with the epithets of "*the erect mien and*
" *heavenly dignity of aspect—the fair and enchanting*
" *form—the vision so delightful,*"—"It is whimsical
" enough, that while the French find their govern-
" ment a mere anarchy of murderers and banditti,
our

“ our English reformers should delineate it as the
 “ peculiar dispensation of Providence showering
 “ blessings on mankind. That while the admini-
 “ strators of the department of Calvados tell the
 “ Convention, that ‘ *Paris is the focus of insurrection,*
 ‘ *vengeance, and proscription, that innocent blood has*
 ‘ *flowed, that villains who are the detestation of the*
 ‘ *nation, and will be the opprobrium of posterity, still*
 ‘ *calculate, in criminal silence, the life and death of*
 ‘ *citizens,*’ “ an Englishman can be found to
 “ declare *such a government so beneficent, that he*
 “ *can refer it only to the First Great Cause of all!*”
 For the words marked with inverted commas, and
 for this last sentiment, he refers to my letter to
 the Duke of Newcastle. Now every one knows
 that on May the 22d, 1792, which was the date of
 my letter to the *Duke of Newcastle*, *Louis* was on
 the throne of France, and the first constitution was
the rule of government; but that before October in
 that year the scene was reversed; the king was im-
 prisoned; the constitution was suspended; and all
 the factions made up, first of priests, noblesse, and
 royalists, struggling to bring back the ancient go-
 vernment; 2dly, of one party to preserve the said
 first constitution, with *Louis* on the throne; 3dly, of
 another party to establish a pure democracy; and
 4thly, a separate party of the profligate to promote
 confusion; besides factions of other descriptions
 were then in full activity. If “ *such a government*”

as Mr. *Young*, by the mouths of his French speakers, has described, could be the object of *my* admiration and praise, doubtless I should merit that execration and deep contempt of my country, which it seems, throughout Mr. *Young's* book, to be his object, for purposes but too apparent, to fix upon me. I was the first to make the necessity of a parliamentary reform the subject of a treatise; but what is worse, in my *Essays* will be found the assertion and vindication of that vital principle of freedom, *personal representation*; and a proof, as I conceive, of our right to *annual parliaments*. Those who were interested in upholding unequal representation and long parliaments, began to feel their cause in great danger, unless they could silence these doctrines by proscription and a system of terror.

Hence the importance of an attack upon one who had maintained and defended them with some success: and the *mode* of attacking him must be referred partly to the system he speaks of, and partly to Mr. *Young's* inability to refute him by sober argument. For having used the words picked out by his commentator, he has so little regret, that he will here repeat the whole passage; especially as he shall again have occasion to refer to it.—“Hitherto, my Lord, I have purposely
“avoided any observations on the French Revolution. But as my rejoicing in that event
“has,

" has, by your Grace, been imputed to me as
 " a crime, it is not fit that I should be silent.
 " Mistake me not, however, my Lord. I am not
 " going to labour a *defence*. I am not about to
 " plead in *excuse* of my conduct. No:—it is with
 " other feelings that I shall speak of the French
 " Revolution. Being a phenomenon in human af-
 " fairs of such extraordinary magnitude, and in-
 " volving in it consequences of such infinite im-
 " portance to our species, it has, in all its stages,
 " been an object of anxious attention to the citizen,
 " the statesman, and the philosopher. To behold
 " a gigantic and horrible despotism, in a season of
 " profound peace, sicken and speedily crumble, by
 " mere natural decay, to its dissolution; while from
 " its ashes, with erect mien, and a heavenly dignity
 " of aspect, was seen rising the fair and enchanting
 " form of a free state, was a spectacle truly calcu-
 " lated to command the admiration of men, to ex-
 " cite enquiry into its true origin, and to interest the
 " wise and the good in the completion of a vision
 " so delightful.* Seeing many millions of my fel-
 " low

* " June 15, 1789. This has been a rich day, and such an
 " one as ten years ago none could believe would ever arrive in
 " France."—" We went immediately to the Hall of the States
 " to secure good seats in the gallery; ——— however, the very
 " size of the apartment, which admits 2000 people, gave a dignity
 " to the scene. It was indeed an interesting one. The spectacle
 " of

" low creatures suddenly redeemed from a cruel
 " servitude degrading to the human species, my
 " heart leaped with joy, and the tear of extatic gra-
 " titude to the Disposer of events glistened in my
 " eye. Revolving in my mind those slow but cer-
 " tain advances of reason, that progress of science,
 " that extension of thought, those juster notions of
 " man's rights, and the irresistible power of truth,
 " which, maturing by imperceptible degrees the
 " seeds of renovation, had so long been preparing
 " *France* for a change; and referring all such secon-
 " dary causes of events to their true original, the
 " First Great Cause of all; HE it was that I con-
 " sidered as the true and proper author of a revo-
 " lution in human affairs so beneficent, so grand,
 " so astonishing. Acting, my Lord, under such
 " impressions, I have no apology to make, for
 " peaceably meeting like-minded men, socially to
 " enjoy satisfactions so exalted. Did I not sincerely
 " rejoice in the French Revolution, I should not
 " dare to call man my brother, nor God my hea-

" of the representatives of 25 millions of people, just emerging
 " from the evils of 200 years of arbitrary power, and rising to
 " the blessings of a freer constitution, assembled with open doors
 " under the eye of the public, was framed to call into animated
 " feelings every latent spark, every emotion of a liberal bosom;
 " —to banish whatever ideas might intrude of their being a pec-
 " ple too often hostile to my own country,—and to dwell with
 " pleasure on the glorious idea of happiness to a great nation—
 " of felicity to millions yet unborn."—*Young's Travels*, p. 110.

venly

“venly father. But my admiration, my Lord, is
 “not a blind idolatry. And although I consider
 “the event, when taken all together, as a glorious
 “dispensation of Divine Providence, to improve
 “the virtue and to promote the happiness of man-
 “kind, yet I by no means hold it to be inconsistent
 “with this idea, that it partakes, as I think in a
 “few instances it does, of the imperfection of man,
 “the immediate agent in giving it being.”

Very far, indeed, am I from feeling shame at having thus expressed myself. What Mr. *Young* ought to feel for having dragged my words from their companions, to give them a *context* of his own;—for *dropping* the date of the letter, which would have shewn that those words *could not* speak of any other than the *first* Revolution;—for *giving* the dates of the French speeches, and *then* introducing me as writing in praise of what at the time *did not exist*, viz. the government of *anarchy*, *proscription*, *massacre*, and *murder*, described in the said speeches;—what, I say, Mr. *Young* ought to feel for a proceeding so foul and so dishonourable, is left to the candid reader to determine.*

* “Having resided a good deal in France during the progress
 “of the Revolution, to which I was, for some time, a *warm*
 “*friend*, &c. The Revolution before the 10th of August,
 “[1792], was as different from the Revolution after that day,
 “as light from darkness.”—*Example of France a Warning to Bri-*
 “*tain*, p. 2, 4.—The reader will recollect that the date of my
 letter was the 22d of May, 1792.

Again :

Again: Mr. *Young*, p. 22. says, the French formed a constitution, "which they could produce, " printed on vellum, and bound in morocco; " carried by every one in his pocket as the charter " of his rights; but unfortunately for theories of " government, this great effort of legislation; " this boast of French, and envy of English Jacobins; the master-piece of the metaphysical " ART of Abbé Sieyès; this quintessence of what " *ought to be*, in opposition to what *is*; this fine " machine pronounced by so many pens immortal; " formed on the idea of Paine, *antecedent to Government, and distinct from it*; this capital production of Gallic genius, endured scarcely two " years. The freedom it afforded was not sufficient for adepts in the Rights of Man; the existence of a King became offensive to the new " lights by which they were illuminated: insurrection was pronounced a sacred duty;—revolt " followed;—and the horrors that will for ever " stain the annals of mankind—the *deep damnation* " that ensued—are written in every heart from " which Jacobinism has not eradicated all traces of " feeling and humanity. Such has been the PRACTICE of the French Revolution*; for its THEORY, " go to *Rights of Man*."—In p. 23. he goes on

* From the preceding argument, the reader might here have expected the word *Constitution*, meaning that of 1789, 1790, and 1791. The *first* Revolution produced the *first* Constitution.

thus :—" *The authority of future assemblies, says Paine, will be to legislate according to the principles prescribed in the constitution; and if experience should shew, that alterations are necessary, they will not be left to the discretionary power of the government.* Before this book was well circulated, that future government pulled down the constitution. He goes on—*A government arising out of society, cannot have the right of altering itself; if it had, it would be arbitrary.* Here he levels point blank the system he wrote five hundred pages to support. Then the French government IS arbitrary.

" Yet these infamies of abstract and ideal perfession are not black enough to deter men from boldly, in the full face of government and day, setting their names to such sentiments as these, in which the British constitution and its friends are thus characterised :—" *The mad counsels of rage and desperation.* Maimed, mutilated, mangled, and wretched condition.*—' Scanty fragments, loathsome offals, are all of freedom that the people of England taste.*—' Mendicants subsisting on crumbs.*—' Visions of slaughtered citizens, and a pillaged nation.*—' Happy Frenchmen! How long will Englishmen endure the shame of seeing their house of Representatives a shocking*

* Letter to the Duke of Newcastle, p. 87, 90, 93, 95.

' contrast

' contrast to models so pure!' 'Not even plausible
 ' concession will now, in my humble opinion, put
 ' the people off their guard, and compromise will
 ' be received as insult. Their demand is their
 ' rights. They want no patrons; and their friends
 ' will be their servants. Their operations are in-
 ' fallible, their strength will soon be invincible.*
 ' Among the discoveries of these pregnant times,
 ' it has been found out, that men may live and
 ' thrive without lords; that the sun will shine
 ' and the dew will descend where there are none
 ' but equal citizens to partake of these blessings;
 ' and that even good laws can be made, and jus-
 ' tice well administered, without either hereditary
 ' legislators or hereditary judges.* The people
 " of England, subdued by wretched artifice and
 " juggling policy;—their violated rights and expiring
 " liberty—says Mr. Sheridan. Victims of venal and
 " perfidious associations—says Mr. Grey.

" Would any person conceive it possible that
 " the passages here collected, expressive of the
 " warmest detestation, were not applied to *France*,
 " as being most peculiarly adapted to mark the
 " state of that kingdom, weltering in its best
 " blood, rather than to one in so singular a state of
 " prosperity as *England*? When our destruction

* Letter to the Duke of Newcastle, p. 89, 99.

“ is threatened so openly—when so clear an explanation is given of the REAL meaning and intentions of the reforming societies—and where the operations and strength of the rabble are so soon to be INVINCIBLE, it surely behoves the government of this country to awaken to danger so imminent; to menaces so audacious; and to a licentiousness of publication which, whatever be the intention, let loose the dæmons of discord, the hell-hounds of the mob, to the utter destruction of all that flourishes at present in this kingdom.*”

The reader will observe, that of the foregoing quotation, that part of it only which is marked with single inverted commas, is taken from my letter to the late *Duke of Newcastle*. When a man of principle feels himself called on to guard the public against danger from the writings of another man, he will at least quote him honestly, and interpret him with candour; he will be careful to come at his real meanings, and will disdain to impose upon his readers, meanings which never were in the mind of the original writer. We will now enquire how far Mr. *Young* has adhered to this honest and liberal line of conduct. As he has very unnecessarily dragged into the dispute two friends of the constitution, Mr. *Burke* and the late

* Example of France a Warning to Britain, p. 22.

Duke of Newcastle, they must first be disposed of before we can proceed. It will be done in a few words. With regard to the noble duke, to whom applied the words ‘*visions of slaughtered citizens and a pillaged nation*,’ it was a principal object of the letter, to prove him an *enemy* to the constitution; and I conceive the proof to have been clearly established. I offered to prove, not only that charge, but others, at the Bar of the Lords, should his Grace think proper to call me thither: but the call never came. So much for one of these friends, so kindly taken by the hand by Mr. *Young*. With respect to Mr. *Burke*, I certainly did apply to his conduct the words—‘mad counsils of rage and desperation’—and much *more* and *stronger* language, which Mr. *Young* did not think fit to quote. I have only to add, that upon the king’s recovery from that unhappy malady which brought on the *regency* struggle in the *House of Commons*, I caused an illumination in the village of my residence, gave roasted sheep, and ale, and music, to the populace, and even drank the king’s health, as a rejoicing *that Mr. Burke had not hurled his Majesty from the throne*.*

b 3

Having

* If it were necessary, I believe I could prove words spoken against the king by Mr. *Burke* while examining Dr. *Willis*, which very words since spoken by other men have caused them

Having thus disposed of these *friends* of the constitution, we come now to the constitution itself, and to Mr. *Young*. Whether he will turn out to be its friend or its enemy, remains to be seen. But before we can fairly proceed, we must first brush away the little obstruction, of ‘infamies of abstract and ‘ideal perfection.’ If more nonsense ever got into less compass, it has escaped my recollection. “But nonsense,” says Mr. *Young*, “when flowing from sedition is not apt to be without a meaning.” (p. 199.) Learning then from hence that nonsense may be sense, and have a meaning;—aye, and a deep meaning too—I am of course led to look for the meaning of his own nonsense. And may I not borrow his own words again, and say “the meaning “evidently is,” (p. 199) not only to prejudice his readers against all *abstract* reasoning, which is the test of truth and the dread of every impostor; but to inflame their minds against those who so exercise their understandings in the cause of freedom and *reform*; and even to insinuate that they are *infamous* persons. We indeed have long known what was meant by the infamies of perverted talents—the infamies of apostacy—the infamies of hired calumniators—and the infamies of false accusers; but to bring

to feel the severities of the law. When Mr. *Burke* used the words alluded to, it was not in the regular course of a parliamentary speech, but *aside*, and yet loud enough to be distinctly heard.

to our knowledge the *infamies of abstract and ideal perfection*, was reserved for the *creative* genius of the great Annalist of Agriculture and the Manifestomonger of Alarm!!! Nor is this the only grand discovery which he has made since his appointment to that honourable office, as in its due place will be shewn. Now, then, we come to the examination of those expressions by which I am said to have "characterised the British constitution." "Would any one," says Mr. *Young* "conceive it possible, that the passages here collected, expressive of the warmest detestation, were not applied to France, as being most particularly adapted to mark the state of that kingdom, weltering in her best blood;" (P. 25 ;) and when, as Mr. *Young* proceeds to say, "insurrection was pronounced a sacred duty;—revolt followed; and the horrors that will for ever stain the annals of mankind—the *deep damnation* that ensued;"—(p. 22) for they had "murdered their king?" (p. 15)—Yes, any one who attended only to the *date* of my letter would certainly conceive it very possible, that the words *were not applied* to what *did not exist* at the time of writing. Why was the *date* overlooked by so keen-eyed a critic as Mr. *Young*? Why were so many pages turned over, forwards and backwards, *without reference*; and here a word and there a word culled for this precious collection; and tortured *without context* to express "the warmest detesta-

“tion” to “England”—that country of the writer, for which he has fought, and to which by the consistency of his life and writings he has manifested an attachment which none can exceed?—And why misrepresent words of indignation and censure, by stating them as used to “characterise *the British constitution*” when he knew—for he could not but know—that they applied exclusively to the *representative body*, of the British Legislature; which every man who knows or who cares any thing about the representation of this country, knows to be in a ‘maimed, mutilated, mangled, and ‘wretched condition;’ and that, compared with the solid and ‘delicious banquet of complete constitutional liberty,’ of which we ought to have in the House of Commons the real substance, the national representation there deserves no better description, than ‘the scanty fragments and loathsome offals,’ ‘the crumbs that fall from the tables of the’ Borough-mongers? And why again so concise in the quotation about the *contrast*, introducing it as a contrast between the *British Constitution and the French Government at a time when the King was murdered, and the Government, as described by Frenchmen, was a Government of madmen, of anarchy, of proscription, massacre and murder, under a powerless Convention*; when Mr. Young knew—for still the *date* of the letter damns his wicked attempt—that that was NOT the contrast drawn by me? ‘Among the legislatures of
‘ those

‘ those nations,* containing no less than *sixteen* representative assemblies of the people, there is not a single PLACEMAN or PENSIONER to be found. Happy Americans! Happy Frenchmen! How long will Englishmen endure the shame of seeing their House of Representatives a shocking contrast to models so pure!†’ p. 93—This was the true contrast drawn by me during the time of the *National Assembly*, and when the king sat on the throne of France, from which Mr. Young so disingenuously pilfers a few words, for a purpose as base as the practice was stupid. My reputation is to be stabbed; my moral character destroyed; and I am

* *America and France.*

† In February 1780, Sir George Saville moved for a full disclosure of the PENSION LIST. It was resisted by the minister, who moved and carried an amendment, by which the *secret* part of the list was still kept in *the dark*. The minority on that question was 188: the majority only two more, viz. 190; and composed as follows:

Pensioners, avowedly so,	—	—	6
Contractors	—	—	14
Placemen	—	—	94
Sons of ditto, and other very near connections			26
Members under no visible influence		—	30
			<hr/>
			190

Here, then, had the uncorrupt principles of impannelling and challenging a *Jury* prevailed, the minister, instead of stifling inquiry by a majority of *two*, would have lost the question by a majority of *one hundred and thirty-eight*.

to be exhibited as a man, delighting in a Government of anarchy, proscription and blood; in order that thereby the doctrine of personal representation may, if possible, receive a deep wound; and the cause of parliamentary reform be the more easily rejected, reprobated, and held up to abhorrence.* The remaining words taken from my letter, are more fairly quoted than criticized: but I shall content myself with only wishing that any one, who doubts of their propriety, will read them in the original, where the context will perhaps explain them to his satisfaction. As to "the reforming societies," Mr. *Young* has so far succeeded in his exhortations to those in power, that a pretty strict enquiry has lately taken place into their "real meaning and intentions;" and that enquiry seems to have ended in shewing their meaning and intentions to have been exactly what they always professed, and neither more nor less than a Reform in the Commons House of Parliament; while perhaps in a little time it will be the means of throwing more

* "By rejecting, reprobating, and holding up to abhorrence, every idea of altering, reforming, or tampering, at so dangerous a crisis, with the constitution to which we owe the prosperity that is so hateful an object to the Jacobins of *France*." p. 191.

"Join in associations for our defence against banditti, cutthroats and Jacobins; join against an enemy more subtle, and therefore more dangerous, the friends of reform," p. 179.

light

light upon *the meaning and intentions* of SOME OTHER PERSONS than they wish; and of convincing them that ‘the spirit of political reform, bottomed on justice and truth; maintained with manly reason; and conducted with peace, order and wisdom; which is now so conspicuously rising, and so rapidly spreading through the land,’* will soon render *the operations of the people infallible, and their strength invincible*, in their endeavours to ‘reinstale the constitution upon its true principles.’*

With respect to our ‘hereditary legislators,’ if Mr. *Young* be their faithful spokesman, as indeed he appears to be, they seem, like too many other people, very slow to take wholesome advice. Both they and all other persons of property would do well, methinks, maturely to consider, ere it be too late, whether the advice of the reformers or of the anti-reformers, be most likely to occasion ‘the utter destruction of ail that flourishes at present in this kingdom.’†

“But that something more than temperate and moderate reform is really the object, we have,” says the sagacious Mr. *Young*, (p. 58) “an un-

* Quotations which Mr. *Young* might have made, for explaining one which he did make, *Letter to the D. of N.* p. 88.

† *Example of France a Warning to Britain.*

“doubted

“ *doubted proof*, in a work published the other
 “ day, by one of the heads of the reforming par-
 “ ties (Major *Cartwright*) who praises the French
 “ Revolution as not the *reformation* of a govern-
 “ ment, but its *utter destruction*, (its *dissolution*, in
 “ the author’s own words;) and erecting in its
 “ room THAT which proved, so soon after the
 “ author dated his letter, and before he published
 “ it, a MONSTER; and is now the bloodiest and
 “ most detestable tyranny that has blotted the an-
 “ nals of modern Europe.”

After the quotations already made from my letter to the D. of N. dated the 22d of May, 1792, what reader of Mr. *Young*’s fourth edition published in 1794 would suppose, by his words “ *the other day*,” that the present reference is to the very same work! But although he now neither mentions *work* nor *date*, but merely the *man*, the reference is not only to the same letter, but to the very same sentence, or paragraph, which in p. 14 he before garbled, to answer the dishonest purpose of imposition. The present specimen of Mr. *Young*’s criticism and candour is as curious as any that have yet appeared. If the reader will look back to p. xiv of this Introduction, he will find the original passage, and sure enough the word ‘ *dissolution*.’ ‘ To behold,’ I had said, ‘ a gigantic and horrible despotism, in a season of pro-
 ‘ found-

‘ found peace, *sicken* and *speedily crumble*, by *mere*
‘ *natural decay*, to its dissolution; while from its
‘ ashes, with erect mien, and a heavenly dignity
‘ of aspect, was seen rising the fair and enchanting
‘ form of a free state, was a spectacle truly cal-
‘ culated, &c.’

Now, if there be an eternal difference between the ideas of NATURAL DEATH, from *sickness* and an *internal decay* of the vital powers; and of MURDER OR MANSLAUGHTER, both implying *external force* and *violence*; there must also be an eternal difference between *natural dissolution* and *utter destruction*. Such an attempt to shew that I relish *destruction* more than *reformation*, is so truly contemptible, that the reader may wonder at the folly of making it. But as we have already been taught, that there is *much meaning in nonsense*, so the meaning of this nonsense may be, to fix on the whole “*reforming party*,” of whom Mr. Young on this occasion takes care to inform us, that Major C. is “*one of the heads*,” the odium of desiring to *destroy*, rather than to *reform*, the British constitution. And that which, according to the close reasoning and logical deduction of the author, and which are so conspicuous in every page of his book, is to constitute the “*undoubted proof*,” “*that something more than temperate and moderate reform is really the object of the reforming party*,” is a
word

word and a *meaning* thrust in by Mr. Young himself, in order to pervert the *word* and the *meaning* of the author. And this is the man who talks of “*lying* petitions,”* and the *impudence* of reformers!† But if I did not praise the French revolution for its *destruction* of the old government, I can tell Mr. Young who did. “However,” says an ingenious and learned traveller, “as these properties‡ were real tyrannies; as they rendered the possession of one spot of land ruinous to all around it—and equally subversive of agriculture, and the common rights of mankind,§ the *utter destruction* brought on all this species of property, does not ill deserve the epithet they are so fond of in France; it is a *real regeneration of the people to the privileges of human nature*. No man of common feelings can regret the fall of that abominable system, which made a whole parish slaves to the lord of the manor.”||

“The candid reader will, I trust, see, that in whatever I have ventured to advance on so cri-

* “That they are not Jacobins, but moderate men, wishing *reform*, is as *impudent* as it would be for a thief to say, that he is not an assassin, because he only holds a candle while another cuts your throat.” P. 175, 236.

† Of the French nobles.

‡ What, Rights of Man!

|| Young’s Travels, p. 541.

“tical

“ tical a subject as this great and unexampled re-
 “ volution, I have assigned the *merit* I think due
 “ to it, *which is the destruction of the old govern-*
 “ *ment, and not the establishment of the new.**”

It is by thus bringing the ingenious gentleman and himself together, that we can best judge what has been HIS *real object* in the publication before us. His travels had the finishing hand put to them in April 1792,† and I am informed were published the following month—the very month in which my letter was written; and it is remarkable that the very paragraph referred to by Mr. *Young*, as declaring approbation of the French Government *during the contest of murdering factions in the winter of 1792, and spring of 1793*, does not even express what the writer thought at the time of writing it, viz. May 1792, but what he *had* thought in July 1791, when he joined in celebrating the anniversary of the destruction of the Bastile.‡ So much for the *accuracy*

* *Young's Travels*, p. 552. † See p. 565.

‡ The 14th September, 1787.—“ To the Benedictine Abbey of St. Germain's.—the Abbot has 13,125l. a year. I lose my patience at such revenues being thus bestowed:—What a noble farm would the fourth of this income establish! what turnips! what cabbages! what potatoes! what clover! what sheep! what wool!—Are not these things better than a fat ecclesiastic?—Pass the BASTILE; another pleasant object to make agreeable emotions vibrate in a man's bosom. I search for good farmers, and run my head at every turn against monks and state prisons.” *Young's Travels*, p. 63.

of

of this able commentator ! But if the parenthesis be left out of the sentence, quoted from Mr. *Young*, it then will clearly be seen, that he directly charges me with praising the revolution *as the utter destruction* of the old government, *and* erecting in its room *that* which proved *before* the letter appeared “*a monster* ;” seeming to insinuate that the letter had actually been written later than its date imported. The truth is, it was dated when finished, and the writer leaving town, it was left with the printer ; a friend having undertaken to correct the press. That friend was obliged to leave town on account of his health ; which circumstance, with others, not difficult to account for while the author was above an hundred miles distant, caused so much delay, that I find by the printer’s books the work was not actually published until the 25th of August ; one cause of that delay, was the author’s sending from the country a *Postscript*, containing *Strictures* on the Minister’s Proclamation recently published, and which appeared to him calculated to spread a dangerous delusion. That *Postscript* was not finished till the 4th of June.— But if the government of Morocco had, between the *date* and the *publication* of my letter, been established in France, what would that have been to the purpose ? A letter dated on the 22d of May, could only have reference to what had passed prior to that date ; and if intended to stamp with approbation

tion what was subsequent to its date, so dating it must have defeated the end. From spies, informers, and false witnesses, may Heaven defend the good people of this land!—When a man can condescend, for the gratification of new friends, to eat his own words;—to call the manly language criminal, which but “*the other day*” he delivered with honest pride;—then to palm upon another person, for the sake of rendering him odious, sentiments only uttered by himself;—and, finally, to drag that person’s own words from their honest connexions, and by subornation and torture compel them to give false evidence against their parent; when, I say, a man can condescend to do all this, to expect either principle or dispassionate argument in the rest of his performance, were not very rational.—And it will accordingly be found, that the sample produced, bad as it is, will not belie the cargo behind. If a farmer will depart from his old approved practice, to try new experiments; take infected seed from the government ‘granaries; sow at a wrong season and on an improper soil; and totally neglect to clean his crop; what can he expect but lean corn and luxuriant weeds, disappointment and disgrace!

But Mr. *Young* has not yet done with that great political sinner *Major C.*—After quoting in p. 107, a work of his—*The People’s Barrier*, without speak-

ing of, or alluding to, any other person, than the author of that work, he makes a flippant remark or two that does not touch the doctrine, and then proceeds thus ; “ Nor let us forget that these men
 “ have been equal friends to the French Revolution from the beginning, and they are steadily
 “ so at this moment ; under the Constituent Assembly, they approved, and published panegyrics on the annihilation of orders ; under the next
 “ assembly, they rejoiced at the demolishing of royalty ; and under the Convention, all the horrors we have seen are insufficient to remove their
 “ approbation.”

When a man, grown callous in the career of calumny, dares wantonly to assert unqualified falsehood, there is but one answer to which he is personally entitled. That answer I give to Mr. *Young*. HE DOES NOT SPEAK TRUTH. When I say *unqualified*, I do not mean *unmixed*. Although in Mr. *Young*'s words, taken collectively, there is a *mixture* of truth, there is also *unqualified* falsehood. It is true, that, to this moment, I have uniformly been a friend to *such a revolution*,* as should give France a free government, in exchange for her antient despotism ; and can lay my hand on my

* In the first constitution, I thought I saw defects ; and on other points, I had doubts. At present, France has no constitution ; but a temporary and revolutionary government.

heart and say, that I have not seen the moment when I could in my conscience wish back that antient despotism, to be rivetted on the people, as a remedy for evils, which, although dreadful, I trusted would be only temporary ; but at the same time it is a base falsehood that I have *equally* approved of all the *means* that have been employed by the successive *actors* since the beginning.* It is *false*, that, under the Constituent Assembly I published panegyrics on the annihilation of orders : It is *false*, that, under the next Assembly, I rejoiced at the demolition of royalty :—Not that I consider royalty in a government as an *end*, but as a *means*. If the habits of a people and the circumstances of the time make it probable that abolishing royalty will produce much more evil than good, it ought to remain, and to be supported. And on the other hand, if the national habits and existing circumstances shew, that to introduce royalty would be to cause much more evil than good, it ought not to be introduced. To attempt at this time to abolish royalty in *England*, I should think, independent of legal criminality, an immoral act ; inasmuch as I believe it would be productive of much more evil than good to society. To attempt, on the other hand, to impose royalty on the *Swiss* or the *Americans*, I should think equally immoral ; and for the

* The true and evident meaning of Mr. Young's words.

same reason. With regard to *France*, I had not sufficient knowledge of the people or of circumstances under the last assembly to know whether the abolition or the retention of royalty was most likely to promote her happiness; but I was inclined to the latter opinion. And at present, I should imagine that if any party in that country were to attempt its restoration, it would probably plunge *France* into new horrors when she seems to be settling into internal tranquillity; and prove the utter destruction of the attempting party, without the smallest chance of doing good: Whereas, there is reason, I think, to hope, from the late change of conduct and tone in the government, and the settled authority to which the Convention hath at last attained, that an end is put to anarchy, and that the people will obtain a constitution to which they will pay a willing obedience.

As the passage now under consideration contains charges which Mr. *Young* means to fix on another as criminal, he is very reprehensible for the loose, but artful language of the first and the last sentences. In p. 59 he is somewhat more intelligible. "I cannot," says he, "well understand on what principles republicans and friends of liberty can now give their approbation to this eventful revolution. To be consistent with their own doctrines, they ought to hold the *actors* as the most fatal

INTRODUCTION.

xxxvii

“ fatal enemies to human liberty the world has ever
“ seen,” &c. With regard to too many of those
actors, this is most true: but what then? Can
we not detest such men—can we not deeply lament
the miseries they occasion—and feel for the hor-
rors which their injured country presents to our
view, without so far *participating in their guilt and*
madness, as to wish an end to that liberty of which
those individuals are so unworthy? Factious dema-
gogues may be unworthy of liberty, but let their
country be free! If Christianity has been wounded
and disgraced by its massacres, and by its butche-
ries, under the denomination of holy wars, let the
actors have the detestation of mankind, but let
Christianity remain. And if the French Revolu-
tion has been dishonoured by crimes, and polluted
by blood, let the guilty perish, or be consigned to
historic infamy; but let the Revolution terminate
in a constitution worthy of the age!

Surely Mr. *Young* does not call the passage he
quoted from my letter about “ hereditary legisla-
tors and hereditary judges,” (see p. 99) “ a pane-
gyric on the annihilation of orders,” when the very
purport, as proved by the *context*,—an accompani-
ment not much in esteem with Mr. *Young*—was
to caution the hereditary orders of this country
against *annihilating themselves*. I had, indeed, re-
monstrated against their *incroachments*; I thought the

privileges conferred on them by the Constitution “*might satisfy a reasonable ambition* ;” I advised them to be content “*with that which was their own* ;” and warned them to reflect on the possible consequences of rejecting such advice at such a period : but, Mr. *Young* is your man to deal with dukes and grandees. “In this thirty-seven miles “of country,” says he, “lying between the rivers “*Garonne, Dordonne, and Charente*, and consequently in one of the best parts of *France* for “markets, the quantity of waste land is surprising ; “it is the predominant feature the whole way. “Much of these wastes belonged to the Prince “*de Soubise*, who would not sell any part of them. “Thus it is wherever you stumble on a Grand “Seigneur, even one that was worth millions, you “are sure to find his property desert. The Duke “of *Bouillon’s* and this prince’s are two of the “greatest properties in *France* ; and all the signs I “have yet seen of their greatness, are wastes, *landes*, “deserts, fern, ling. — Go to their residence, “wherever it may be, and you would probably “find them in the midst of a forest, very well “peopled with deer, wild boars, and wolves.— “*Oh ! if I was the legislator of France for a day, I “would make such great lords skip again.*” * And afterwards, speaking of “the Nobility,” he says,

* *Travels*, p. 48.

“fortunately

“fortunately for *France*, they fall without a struggle, and die without a blow.”*

But admitting that in this country there are men who do not imagine that either the *goodness* of magistracy or the *wisdom* of aristocracy can be so well communicated to a government, by the device of hereditary succession, in *England*; as they might by election,—a mode recommended by profound writers, and with some success practised in America;†—does such an opinion violate any law? does it offend against any principle of morals? does it contradict any precept of Christ?—Of all men in this country, who, then, can be called good citizens?—who can have merit in conscientiously supporting our present constitution, for the sake of public peace and happiness, if not such men as these!—And who such deadly enemies to that constitution, as those who would entail upon it all its diseases and lamentable corruptions; and who are perpetually calumniating with the most rancorous hate such as aim at removing these diseases and corruptions, by a reform on the true principles of

* *Travels*, p. 147.

† One of the writers in a Collection of Tracts published by Messrs. *Reeves and Co.* of the Crown and Anchor Association, sees so close an affinity between the English and the American Constitutions, that he calls the United States *the American kingdom*, or somewhat perfectly equivalent, for I quote by memory.

that constitution alone; and not by any rule of a more abstract perfection conceived in their own minds !

What follows my last quotation from Mr. *Young's* book, in p. 108, and addressed personally to *Major Cartwright*, about what he really means, the company he keeps—the overthrow of the government—Jacobin banners—French events—and the rest, is too contemptible for his notice. But before I dismiss the present attack, I will do justice to the ingenuity of it, small as that ingenuity is. Every reader of Mr. *Young's* book, who had not met with *The People's Barrier*, on observing Mr. *Young's* quotation, and the strain of argument which immediately follows; connecting the author with the revolution of *France*, and with the pretended attempts to overthrow the government of *England*, must naturally imagine—as who can doubt Mr. *Young* intended he should—that *The People's Barrier* was one of the publications of “*the other day*,” written with the views imputed to the author by Mr. *Young*; for that candid gentleman took care to curtail the title,* and to suppress the date, which was 1780, nine years before the dawn of the French Revolution.

* *The People's Barrier against Undue Influence and Corruption; or, The Commons House of Parliament according to the Constitution.*

In the same spirit, and with the same abridged title and omission of *date*, Mr. *Young*, in p. 249, again writes and quotes as follows:—"If any one doubts what our reformers really look for, let him reflect on a passage in *The People's Barrier*; the author is contending for universal suffrage in the election of representatives—"By the word representatives, I by no means intend to deny or derogate from the right of *the Commons at large*, for that the original power and authority reside in them, is implied in the very word itself." Here representation is cut up by the roots, in the very language of the tribunes in the National Convention;—the constitution contended for is professed to be mob and anarchy!! Here is boldness of assertion with a witness! To texts and contexts Mr. *Young* seems to have as "constitutional an abhorrence," as he tells us (p. 4) he has "of theory—of all trust in abstract reasoning." Now the text, upon which the words quoted by Mr. *Young* are a *note*, runs thus: 'The making of laws for this realm is, by the constitution, lodged in the hands of *king, lords of parliament, and the representatives of the Commons.*' Is this professing to contend for a constitution of mob and anarchy? Now I pray you, gentle reader, to make out if you can, how, by the distinction taken in the note on this passage, representation is cut up by the roots. Mr. *Young*,
I presume,

I presume, has his representative in *Smithfield*, to dispose of the fat sheep and oxen he sends up from *Bradfield*: But he might be a little surprised to hear it asserted, that such representative possessed an independent right to dispose of his property, without deriving that right from Mr. *Young's* 'original power and authority.' And if even his friend Mr. *Reeves* were to tell him, that by maintaining and asserting such his 'original power and authority,' to appear himself in person at *Smithfield*, for disposing of his own property, provided it were *convenient* so to do, he thereby cut up representation by the roots, or, in other words, all employing of salesmen, and all right in them to act as representatives when appointed for that purpose; I believe he would have the same suspicion of his Crown and Anchor friend, as in May 1792 he entertained of "Messrs. *Burke* and *Calonne*," on account of their writings against the French Revolution; when he, (Mr. *Young*) published as follows:—"I say, that temperate men must conclude, that the advantages derived to the nation [France] are of the very first importance, and such as must inevitably secure to it, as long as they continue, an uncommon degree of prosperity. The men who deny the benefit of such events,* must have something sinister in their

* As he had just enumerated.

“ views, or *muddy in their understandings.*”^{*} Supposing infirmity, or other cause, to reduce it to a *certainty*, that in future it must for ever be utterly *impracticable* to Mr. *Young*, or his heir in the *Bradfield* estate, to transact his own business at *Smithfield* in person; would even that circumstance derogate in the smallest degree from his “ original power and authority,” to act there by a *representative*? Or, in other words, could his Salesman dispose of his sheep and oxen, unless deputed and authorised so to do by himself?—Without a representative, there is no constituent: without a constituent, there is no representative. If I wanted to ‘ cut up representation by the roots,’ I should abandon the doctrines I have been maintaining for a great part of my life, wheel round like a weathercock, and apply for assistance to Mr. *Young*, who tells me that, “ To call them” [the members of the House of Commons, “ *chosen* by certain “ bodies, who, by the constitution, have the privilege of *electing* them”] “ the representatives “ of the people, is a very inaccurate mode of expression; they ought never to be called by any “ other name than the House of Commons, to “ distinguish them from the House of Lords. If “ they were *really* the representatives of the *people*, “ they might in theory be good, or better; but

^{*} *Travels*, p. 555.

“ they would be something else than what *they*
 “ *are,*” &c. The notion of *representation* and de-
 “ legation of rights and privileges from the elec-
 “ tors, has vitiated and turned to confusion so
 “ many ideas on the subject, because writers and
 “ parliaments themselves, to suit the purpose of a
 “ moment, have thought it for their interest to be
 “ esteemed something *different from what* they
 “ really are. The electors of members of parlia-
 “ ment *do not* delegate powers, nor intrust privi-
 “ leges, if, by delegation, is meant the transfer of
 “ something possessed by those who depute; for
 “ the electors have neither those powers nor those
 “ privileges, and therefore cannot delegate them.
 “ But the members when elected, and in combi-
 “ nation with the other branches of the legislature,
 “ *assume*, and possess, and *give themselves* such
 “ powers and privileges, which those did not pos-
 “ sess who sent them.”* (89, 90, 91). “ The
 “ House of Commons was not created by *the peo-*
 “ *ple*, but by *the crown*; never did represent the
 “ people in any period of our history; and is not
 “ responsible to the people.” (200).

* I hope Mr. Young's Salesman will not become his disciple; and *assume*, and give *himself* the power and privilege of putting in his own pocket, the produce of the *Bradfield* sheep and oxen; because I am not willing that the sheep and oxen from *Brother-toft Farm* should be disposed of in the same way.

It is somewhat late in the present controversy on reforming the House of Commons, to go back beyond the conquest for authorities; and weak indeed must be Mr. *Young's* arguments against that reform, if he feels himself driven to that wretched shift. His appendix for the most part would figure better amongst the antiquarian trash of the Gentleman's Magazine, than in a political discourse of 1794. In that appendix he quotes, and perhaps refutes, *The People's Barrier*, respecting a representation of the Commons in the Saxon Parliaments. Had he turned to p. 29 of that work, he would have seen with what sovereign contempt I look on such disputes. "With regard to the
" RIGHTS OF FREEDOM, the laws, precedents, and
" usages of antiquity as *foundations*, are in themselves not worth a straw; and I have introduced
" them only by way of satisfying *weak minds*,
" which doubt whether or not they have a right to
" wear their noses without having a royal grant or
" charter for it, or some positive law in the statute-book. To be a MAN is, at all times and
" in all countries, a title to LIBERTY; and *he who*
" *doth not assert it*, deserves not the name of a
" MAN!" If historians have reported rightly, that the system of *Frank-Pledge* was established by *Alfred*, that every *Householder* by that system was armed; and that it was the object of that godlike prince to render the English *as free as their own*
thoughts,

thoughts, I cannot well reconcile all this with Mr. *Young's* idea, that the Commons in those days were no better off than he represents them to have been after the Norman conquest and tyranny in the times of Ed. I. and Ed. III. when according to him, none had representation in parliament, but "land possessors holding by military tenure; all beneath were of no more account, in great national assemblies, than the cows, sheep, and hogs of the kingdom." (238). But, be it just as Mr. *Young* pleases!

SECTION II.

Mr. Young's mode of refuting Paine.

When I consider Mr. *Young's* mode of criticising the writings of *Paine*, whether its unfairness ought to excite more contempt, or its effrontery more astonishment, I am unable to decide. That *Paine's* works are bad writings, or himself a bad man, are questions to be decided by evidence and by argument; and none but bad or bigotted men can reject undeniable or unanswerable argument, on that or any other question. If you put either a man, or his writings, upon trial, let him have fair play. But what has been the fairness shewn *Paine* by Mr. *Young*? We have heard much of *Roberespierre's* Revolutionary Tribunal, but we may safely challenge the bitterest enemy of that monster and his system, to produce the

the records of any trial before that tribunal, in which less pretensions to fairness have been shewn, than on the trial of *Paine's* works in Mr. *Young's* new tribunal of criticism, himself playing the parts of accuser and judge.* Happy for the cause of freedom that such accusers and such judges cannot convict, without that most enlightened and incorruptible of all juries, the public!—In my own case, I have already taken some notice of a particular aversion in Mr. *Young*, while hostilely quoting the writings of another man, to that stubborn thing called a *context*; but in the case of Mr. *Paine* I own it is not in my power to do Mr. *Young* justice. It would require a volume; and I will answer for it, a much larger one than *Paine* himself will bestow upon him. In this controversy with *Paine*, Mr. *Young* has taken effectual care to secure himself the *last word*; for he has carefully

* Mr. *Young* has for some time past been in the habit of attending in one particular more than formerly to the *title* of his monthly work, *The Annals of Agriculture and other useful arts*; and making it a pretty regular *Review of Political Writings*; and as his steadiness and impartiality in politics have been so conspicuous, doubtless this part of his labours will highly edify the farmers of Great Britain. And, if I be not deceived by the internal evidence of language which I find in p. 199 of *The Example of France a Warning to Britain*, I perceive him also anonymously exercising his critical acumen and impartiality in a new work called, I think, the *British Critic*; which was put into my hand, to shew me the strictures on my *Letter to a Friend at Boston*.

abstained

abstained from informing his reader either in what *page*, or in what *volume* of Paine's writings the words which he puts into the mouth of that author are to be found, except in two instances only. One of those instances occurs in p. 32, and the other in p. 52; both relating to *facts* at Paris and Versailles, the latter of which Mr. *Young* is able to contradict from having been at the time upon the spot; but his direct quotations marked as such, but not shewing where to find them, independent of allusions in plenty, are not fewer in number than FIFTY. What enquirer can undertake to hunt in the dark through *Paine's* works for every text as it occurs! A happy device this, of Mr. *Young's*, to prevent a *cross examination* of his witnesses! I certainly do not mean to discuss fifty or even five questions on the science of government, as an advocate for Mr. *Paine*, but I think it a duty to the public,—that public on which Mr. *Young* has attempted to impose—to call its attention to the *môde* of proof set up by Mr. *Young*, before it obtain the authority of a precedent, to be followed by other public accusers. Two or three specimens will amply suffice.

1. "Every thing with us, according to Paine,
"has a constitution except the nation; and if we
"had a constitution we should be able to produce it.
"The French, on the contrary, formed one which
"they

“ they could produce, printed on vellum, and
 “ bound in morocco ; carried by every one in his
 “ pocket as the charter of his rights ;* but, un-
 “ fortunately for theories of government, this great
 “ effort of legislation, the boast of French and
 “ envy of English Jacobins ; this masterpiece of the
 “ metaphysical ART of Abbé Sieyès ; this quint-
 “ essence of what *ought to be*, in opposition to what
 “ *is* ; this fine machine pronounced by so many
 “ pens immortal ; formed on the idea of *Paine*, an-
 “ tecedent to government, and distinct from it ; this
 “ capital production of Gallic genius ENDURED
 “ SCARCELY TWO YEARS.”—By this *mode* of rea-
 soning, I suppose we are to learn, that *because*
 principles are *violated*, they are no longer princi-
 ples ; that *because* wisdom is *overpowered* by folly,
 it is no longer wisdom ; and *because* justice is *de-*
feated by villainy, it is no longer justice ; *because*
 our good allies the Empress of *Russia* and the King
 of *Prussia* did not allow the constitution of *Poland*
 to endure for TWO YEARS ; *therefore* those who
 framed that constitution were as great fools as *Paine* ;
 and *because* those monsters, (one of them just fur-
 nished with a good supply of English guineas) in
 violation of every human right, have a second time
 trampled on the liberties of that unhappy country,

* If any person will declare in what author a full, clear, and
undisputed definition or description of the English Constitution is
 to be found, the public will doubtless be very thankful to him.

and their accursed armies have drank deep of its blood; *therefore*, we are to infer that the principles of liberty and the Rights of Man are the "insanity of innovation," and the "theory of sedition." (p. 194, 64, 105.) By the same *mode* of arguing, it may be proved, that *because* the Israelites, soon departed from the one God, declared in the first article of their first constitution, and worshipped a calf; *therefore* that one God ceased to exist, or to merit regard.—Admirable reasoning! — How consistent, how convincing, how lucid the arguments of this great political luminary, at whose appearance those meaner stars, Paine, Grey, Erskine, and Sheridan, are doomed to hide their diminished heads!—And now for one specimen more. This prince of critics first tells us of "Paine's *mountebank maxims*," and then in the same breath adds, "his theories should always be "brought to the *test* of French practice." (172.) O Mountebanks and Merry Andrews, which of ye in your merriment ever dealt out so ridiculous a maxim as this! The merit of Farmer *Young's* theory of husbandry to be tried by the *test* of the practice of a herd of swine that root up his fields!—Paul's divinity to be brought to the *test*, of what was practised by the polluted sinners of Corinth!—The excellence of a theory of medicine to be tried by the *test* of the practice of the intemperate, the drunkard, and the debauchee; and the goodness
of

of a theory of law, to be judged of, by the conduct of those who live in the habitual *practice* of violating every law human and divine! Again: "*The authority of future Assemblies, says Paine, will be to legislate according to the principles prescribed in the constitution; and if experience should shew that alterations are necessary, they will not be left to the discretionary power of government.*" BEFORE HIS BOOK WAS WELL CIRCULATED, THAT FUTURE GOVERNMENT PULLED DOWN THE CONSTITUTION." p. 23. Here is refutation! *Because* an agent throws into the fire his letter of attorney, and acts in defiance of his principal, *therefore* it is folly *to teach*, that a principal has a right to issue a letter of attorney, and that his agent ought to act only as that authority prescribes. But if doctrines flowing from the rights of nature be now so offensive, why is *Paine* to bear all the blame? Why does not Mr. *Young* impeach and vilify THE WHOLE PEOPLE OF *America*, for having acted upon these doctrines; when they prescribed to their several legislatures the rules by which they should legislate; and to their governments the rules by which they should govern; in CONSTITUTIONS, first framed and ratified, and afterwards revised, amended, and confirmed by THEMSELVES; expressly reserving to themselves the future exercise of a like power.* Why is not

d 2

the

* "As it is a leading principle with the Americans (and certainly a very wise one) never to preclude themselves or their
" posterity

the *Earl of Abingdon* also an object of Mr. *Young's* scurrility and abuse for having maintained, that,
 " In the great *machine* of state there are found three
 " *principal powers*, with a variety of others subordi-
 " nate to them ; particularly the prerogative of the
 " crown : which is a *power* there vested not to coun-
 " teract the *higher powers*, but if at any time there
 " should be occasion, to supply their deficien-
 " cies. The first of these *principal powers* is the
 " *power* of the *people* ; the second, the *power* of the
 " *constitution* ; the third, the *power* of the *law*.
 " Now the *power* of the *people* is first, because,
 " without *people* there could be neither *constitution*
 " nor *law*. The *power* of the *constitution* is second,
 " for it is the immediate effect of this first cause ;
 " and if the *people* and the *constitution* make the first
 " and the second *power*, there is no need to prove
 " that the *law* is the third *power* of the state. It
 " follows in the order I have laid down. As from
 " the *people* then is derived the *constitution*, so from
 " the *constitution* is derived the *law* ; the *constitution*
 " and the *law* being, in a due course of lineal con-
 " sanguinity, the descendants of the *people*."

" posterity the benefit of experience, the American Governments
 " contain a provision for revising them at future periods, by
 " electing CONVENTIONS originally from the people for
 " that end. It was for this purpose and on this principle, that
 " the CONVENTION which sat during the last summer at the
 " city of Philadelphia, and of which Gen. Washington was
 " President, was appointed."—*The Federal Constitution of the*
United States of America, p. 4.

Again :

INTRODUCTION.

liii

Again: " The lines of distinction betwixt the
 " people, the constitution, and the law, are marked
 " there [in America] as they are drawn here.
 " The constitution is derived from the people, and
 " the law from the constitution. The law cannot
 " alter the constitution: for all and every law and
 " statute that are, by the general courts (equal to
 " our parliaments) made contrary thereto are null
 " and void: neither is the constitution *alterable*,
 " but by general CONVENTIONS OF THE PEOPLE
 " AT LARGE, held *expressly* and *solely* for that pur-
 " pose."*

Having thus introduced one who is so well able to defend Mr. *Paine* on the present occasion, I shall leave the noble Lord and Mr. *Young* together, and proceed to the next matters I have promised to speak to.

SECTION III.

Mr. *Young*'s fluent and ingenious rage against Personal Representation, Reform, Reformers, and the French Revolution.

Ere I enter on this part of my work, it is necessary to notice an *omission* of which Mr. *Young*

* *Thoughts on the Letter of Edmund Burke, Esq; to the Sheriffs of Bristol*, l. 22, 35.

has been guilty; and for which the word "guilty" ought not, as I apprehend, to be received in its figurative, but in its literal sense; because the omission appears to have been intentional, and in order to bring about a cruel and immoral purpose. The omission to which I allude, is that of not giving his readers the precise sense, in which certain words and phrases frequently introduced are to be received and understood; particularly the very favourite word *Jacobin*, and the phrase *French principles*. The ambiguities with which language in itself unavoidably abounds, has been a constant theme of regret, amongst all such as sought to enlighten mankind, by inculcating important truth; and to advance their happiness, by explaining and demonstrating the great principles of government and morals, so clearly and so plainly that common sense should comprehend them. The great *Bacon*, in his *Treatise Of the Advancement of Learning*, says, "Let us consider the false appearances that
" are imposed upon us by *words* which are framed
" and applied, according to the conceit and capacities of the vulgar sort:" &c. "so as it is
" almost necessary in all controversies and disputations to imitate the wisdom of the mathematicians, in setting down, *in the very beginning*,
" the *definitions* of our words and terms, that others
" may know how we accept and understand them,
" and whether they concur with us or not. For it
" cometh

INTRODUCTION.

lv

“ cometh to pass, for want of this, that we are
 “ sure to end there where we ought to have begun,
 “ which is, *in questions and differences about words.*”
 And so it now happens. After Mr. *Young*’s book
 has been circulating two years, we are obliged to
 ask what he can mean by certain words, used for
 the cruel and immoral purpose of so spreading
 public delusion and prejudice, and so calumniating
 certain descriptions of men, that they may thereby
 be rendered objects of persecution, that their for-
 tunes and their lives may be successfully attacked,
 and that the whole circle of their families and chil-
 dren may be involved in distress. What, for in-
 stance, shall we think of the use made by Mr.
Young of the word *Jacobin*; used to imply some-
 thing very shocking, which he neither defines nor
 explains, *while he applies the word in criminal ac-*
cusation; a word which, as hereafter shall suit his
 purpose, he may interpret just as he pleases! A
 sincere regard for truth does not lead to such adop-
 tions. An honourable mind will not think such
 unfair weapons ought to be used, in the warfare of
 controversy. Neither “ the wisdom of the mathe-
 “ maticians,” nor the virtue of the moralists, will
 approve of “ the false appearances that are imposed
 “ upon us by words.” The word *Jacobin*, as used
 by Mr. *Young*, ought to mean one of these two
 things—either a body of men holding a *precise*
creed in politics; or merely a body of men who

have obtained that appellation, but without agreeing in political sentiments. If the former, it is necessary that he gives us *the exact creed to which the Jacobins subscribe*, that when he applies the word to Englishmen, we may know his meaning; and that when he accuses particular persons of being *Jacobins*, or of holding *Jacobin principles*, they may understand what it is he imputes to them.

At present, I am conspicuously held forth as amongst those whom Mr. *Young* calls *Jacobins*; but whether to accept or to reject his distinction, I am wholly at a loss; because in the present state of his mind, what he sometimes treats as criminal, I certainly hold to be meritorious: and *vice versa*. He seems, for instance, to think that, by branding a man with the appellation of *Reformer*, he has made him odious; while in my eyes it is, in the present situation of our country, a stamp of distinguished merit. But if, in Mr. *Young's* vocabulary, *Reformer*, *Jacobin*, and *Cut-throat*, are all to mean the same thing, then I acknowledge that it is in vain to reason with the gentleman.

What we are to understand by *Jacobin principles*, cannot be understood, till Mr. *Young* shall condescend to define or describe them in plain terms and sober language; because I conceive the
Jacobin

Jacobin Club to have consisted of many thousand persons, differing in their principles, and from time to time varying from themselves; inasmuch that, amongst that fluctuating body, and the fluctuating minds by which it has at different periods been animated, there probably have been principles as wide as the poles asunder. It should seem therefore, that any attempt to stigmatise classes of men in this country, by generally imputing to them principles which, if analysed, would turn out to be made up of sense and nonsense, virtue and vice, and all the contraries and extremes that can possess the mind of man, is an attempt equally insidious and reprehensible. In a criminal charge, it is evident that the unexplained word *Jacobin* is in the highest degree vague; and it needs but little discernment to perceive, that vague accusations, striking at men's fortunes, honour, peace, and existence, are in the nature and the spirit of assassination. Until, therefore, some other definite sense, which we can understand, is affixed to the word *Jacobin*, besides that of a mere *appellation* to express a certain society of men, that alone is the sense in which it must be received; and then we shall find that when *Jacobins* are mentioned, Mr. Young is included; as being a member of that celebrated society, elected on the 18th of January, 1790. "At night," says he, "Monsieur Diere-
tot, and Monsieur Blin, carried me to the Re-
volution

“ volution Club at the *Jacobins*; the room where
 “ they assemble, is that in which the famous league
 “ was signed, as it has been observed above.
 “ There were above one hundred *Deputies* present,
 “ with a President in the chair; I was handed to
 “ him, and announced as the author of the *Arith-*
 “ *metique Politique*; the President standing up,
 “ repeated my name to the company, and de-
 “ manded if there were any objections—None;
 “ and this is all the ceremony, not merely of an
 “ introduction, but an *election*: for I was told that
 “ now I was free to be present when I pleased,
 “ being a foreigner. Ten or a dozen other elec-
 “ tions were made. In this club, the business that
 “ is to be brought into the National Assembly is
 “ regularly debated; the motions are read that are
 “ intended to be made there, and rejected or cor-
 “ rected and approved. When these have been
 “ fully agreed to, the whole party are engaged to
 “ support them. Plans of conduct are there de-
 “ termined; proper persons nominated for being
 “ of Committees, and Presidents of the Assembly
 “ named. And I may add, that such is the ma-
 “ jority of numbers, that whatever passes in this
 “ club is almost sure to pass in the Assembly.”*

Now as Mr. *Young*, so late as May 1792, published much panegyric on the French Revolution,

* *Travels*, p. 276.

a Revolution principally brought about by his brethren, the *Jacobins*; and as he does not appear, notwithstanding the account he gives of himself, that “if there be one principle more predominant than another in his politics, it is *the principle of change*,” (p. 4) to have changed his sentiments for two years and a half from the time of his fraternizing with that society, it is but reasonable to suppose that he found some at least of the *principles* of the *Jacobins*, such as still merited his approbation; unless with this changeable gentleman principles themselves are to change with events. If this be admitted, all reasoning whatever is folly: but if principles remain, though *conduct changes*, it is the more incumbent on Mr. *Young* to discriminate amongst *Jacobin principles*, between what are good and what are bad; lest, having proved him to have been received into the bosom of the society, some rash persons should thence be led to shun him, by the advice of one who teaches us, to “loathe a Jacobin, with the same detestation as “noxious animals of hideous deformity.”*—Nor will it be improper to ask that gentleman, from what men amongst the *Jacobins* he learned that detestation of all abstract questions, that abhorrence of reforming *upon principle*, that licentiousness of denunciation and vague accusation; that inclination to spread delusion; and that hearty desire of establishing in this country a system of

* *Example of France a Warning to Britain*, p. 169.

proscription and terror, which are amongst the predominate features of *The Example of France a Warning to Britain*.

After what has been said concerning *Jacobin* principles, a phrase that could answer no other purpose, than that of delusion, it must be superfluous to enter into a similar discussion of what this author can mean by *French* principles. I shall therefore only repeat a few words, with which, on a former occasion, I concluded some observations on this subject.—‘By English principles, I presume are meant, the genuine principles of the English constitution. It is therefore in the French constitution alone, that we are to look for French principles. Let them speak for themselves.’*

Having made these preliminary observations, I now proceed to enter upon the immediate subject of the present Section; beginning it with some general reflections on Personal Representation or Universal Suffrage.

When the advocates for this mode of representation recollect, that it has had to contend with every corrupt interest in the State; with the whole

* *Letter to a Friend at Boston*, p. 56.

authority, power, and influence of the wealthy ; with the cold indifference of the selfish and the indolent ; with the prejudices of the proud and the ignorant ; and with all the talents and wit of the learned ; and when at the same time they observe, that of all the systems of parliamentary reform which have ever been proposed, that alone which is bottomed on this simple principle, appears to have taken any firm rooted hold in the minds of men ; when, I say, they observe this, as a broad, unquestionable fact, they persuade themselves that they are not in an error. They are grateful to that Power which hath written on the heart of man the indelible law of nature ; stamped on his mind the impression of truth ; and endowed him with a faculty by the use of which he can render that truth of service to himself, and arrive at conclusions necessary to his safety and happiness. They believe the principles of the system in question not only to be found in the law of England, but to have the solid support of holy writ, and to flow also from the pure sources of nature and truth, so obviously as to admit in the attentive mind of no doubt : in short, that legislative *representation*, in every political community too large for the *personal* consultation of all its members, is due to a man, because HE IS A MAN ; and not a beast. The principle we know has provoked the frowns of a *Pitt*, the sarcasms of a *Dundas*, the ribbald buffoonery

foonery of a *Soame Jennings*, and the mighty rage of the great *Mr. Young*;—and what then? Why, it is still preached, and the multitude believe. No talents can prevail against TRUTH. The sagacious *Dundas* ventured not beyond a sneer: *Jennings* attempted ridicule, and made himself ridiculous: *Pitt* reasoned, and talked nonsense: On the 7th of May, 1793, he spoke as follows; “ Among
“ the various expedients that had been devised to
“ bar the entrance of such influence into the
“ House, he had heard principally of three: One
“ was to extend the right of voting for members
“ to serve in Parliament, which was now so con-
“ fined, to all the inhabitants of the kingdom in-
“ discriminately; so that every man, without the
“ distinction of freeholder, or freeman of a cor-
“ poration, should have the franchise of a vote for
“ a person to represent him in parliament; and
“ this mode he understood was thought by those
“ who patronised it, as the only one that was con-
“ sistent with true liberty in a free constitution;
“ where every one ought to be governed by those
“ laws only to which they have actually given their
“ consent, either in person or by their representa-
“ tives. For his part, he utterly rejected and
“ condemned this mode, which it was impossible
“ for him to adopt, without libelling those re-
“ nowned forefathers who had framed the consti-
“ tution in the fullness of their wisdom, and
“ fashioned

“ fashioned it for the government of freemen, not
 “ of slaves: *If this doctrine should obtain, nearly*
 “ *one half of the people must in fact be slaves, for it*
 “ *was absolutely impossible, that this idea of giving*
 “ *to every man a right of voting, however finely it*
 “ *may appear in theory, could ever be reduced to*
 “ *practice; but though it were even practicable, still*
 “ *one half of the nation would be slaves; for all*
 “ *those who vote for the unsuccessful candidates can-*
 “ *not, in the strictness of this doctrine, be said to be*
 “ *represented in parliament; and therefore they are*
 “ *governed by laws to which they give not their as-*
 “ *sent, either in person or by representatives; con-*
 “ *sequently, according to the ideas of the friends of*
 “ *this expedient, all those who vote for unsuccessful*
 “ *candidates, must be slaves, &c.*” * Now, what
 I call nonsense, I have distinguished by the *Italic*
 character. In the first place, it is palpable non-
 sense for a statesman to say, it is *absolutely impossi-*
ble to extend the right of voting to every member
 of society. The *Duke of Richmond's* bill of 1780
 would have done the business completely. Se-
 condly, what is said about voting for *unsuccessful*
 candidates, arises from a want of clear ideas on the
 subject. None who *patronise* universal suffrage
 have the folly here imputed to them. Their doc-
 trine is this: A member of parliament who repre-

* Wyvill's Political Papers, II. 640.

sents the elective *body*, of which *John, Thomas, and Harry* are *members*, necessarily represents *John, Thomas, and Harry*, whether they individually voted for or against him. And *John, Thomas, and Harry*, merely by having *a right to vote*, for a representative of that elective *body* of which they are severally *members*, do enjoy *political freedom*; because the *body* of which they are *members*, and in which (to borrow a very innocent phrase, in which some wise men lately smelt a sort of treason) they enjoy *equal active citizenship*, is, in the full sense of the words, politically free. If then the whole body be completely free, so must be all the members. But when I said Mr. *Pitt* did not understand principles so clear as these, perhaps I did him wrong. It is for him to shew, whether the error lay in his head or his heart.

The more I contemplate the system of personal representation, and the signs of the times when it appears destined to stand a great bulwark of our freedom, the more thankful am I to Providence for having enabled me to bear some testimony in its favour.* 'Tis, methinks, a pyramid that lifts
its

* See the Legislative Rights of the Commonalty vindicated; published in 177 .

The People's Barrier against undue Influence and Corruption.
A Letter to the Deputies of the Associated Counties, Cities and Towns.

its head above the clouds of the troubled atmosphere, and smiles at the pelting tempest of words. Storms that raise the desert itself into the air may indeed hide its foundations, by the heaps of sand they leave at its feet; but, so hidden, they are only rendered the more immovable.

As it was the writer's lot to be one of the first who called the attention of the public to the defects in the national representation; so it has been his province, from time to time, to combat such objections to the doctrine as seemed worthy of notice. That bringing the House of Commons to a dependence on the people, must end in abolishing the nobility, and dismissing the king*, is not a new objection. It was the very same which all the wiles and wit of the elegant and courtly *Jennings* were exerted to support. Trusting that I gave a complete answer to the *master*†, who was both dextrous and cool in the use of his weapons, I may be the less afraid to take up the gauntlet of the *scholar*, whose skill is not quite so formidable; and

Internal Evidence; in answer to Soame Jennings.

Letter to the Duke of Newcastle.

Letter to a Friend at Boston.

Besides which, volumes of detached Essays, and Correspondence.

* *Example of France, a Warning to Britain*, p. 203, 205.

† See Internal Evidence.

whose ardent temperament lays him somewhat more open to assault. In what I have already written on the general subject of representation, and in vindication of reform, I conceive the present assailant to be completely refuted by anticipation: he has not started one new idea on the subject. But his way of answering argument, is to work up his own passions to an holy furor, hurrying his reader into the scenes of blood and anarchy in *France*, (all which he ridiculously imputes to the doctrine I maintain) then to fly out into disgust, contempt, and ravings about reforming *on principle*; and to be seized with a loathing of all *theory*; as well as with abhorrence and execration of all *reformers*. In his whole book there is scarcely a page which exhibits the politeness of a gentleman, the prudence of a politician, the calmness of a philosopher, or the charity of a Christian; but like an ill tutored tragedy player, he pours out his declamatory rant; stamps, foams, swears, and calls foul names; out-heroding, as I apprehend, all the political Herods that ever fretted on the stage of faction or corruption.

As a letter which I wrote in March 1794 contains much of what has occurred to me on the subject of personal representation, since I formerly published my sentiments thereupon, I shall present

INTRODUCTION.

lxvii

the reader with an extract, in which will also be found some arguments in favour of a Ballot.

“Seeing, Sir, as you do, the true securities of freedom to consist in the two principles of *numbers* and of *time*; of *numbers* in respect of the electors; and of *time* in respect of the continuance of power in the hands of the elected; view not these principles superficially; and beware how you depart from them in the smallest degree. Having for their foundations the laws of nature, depend upon it you may confide in them with more safety, than in “the institutions of your ancestors.” If electing our representatives be, as you truly call it, “a common right,” is it not more consonant with justice and prudence, to protect this common right in the poor, so that both he and the public shall benefit from his exercising it, than to rob him of it under any pretext whatever. Then why not adopt the ballot? It is necessary to the poor man’s protection, it is necessary to the protection of a majority of those whom by your own plan you allow to vote. In a democracy, where an equality of property and power took place to a great degree, it might be less necessary, but every man who contemplates the state of property in this country, and the hereditary powers sanctioned by our constitution, must admit of the necessity of a ballot on a principle of justice.

I know the general arguments against it; but they are not solid. A fact which I received from the lips of President *Lawrence* outweighs them all:—About fifty years ago attempts were made by the wealthy in *South Carolina*, with all the arts of popularity, to corrupt the elections of the Assembly. An alarm was taken, and the ballot established. From that moment to the period of the Revolution, the elections had remained pure and unsuspected. And the case is the stronger, as within that period two attempts were made to tamper with the electors, notwithstanding the ballot. They both excited popular indignation, and ended in disappointment and disgrace to their authors. Nor would the ballot prevent “the natural weight of property from preponderating in the degree it ought to do.” As a general principle, and that is sufficient, the poor as naturally side with their landlord or rich neighbour, *who makes a laudable use of his wealth and deserves esteem*, as the sparks fly upwards. Can there be a stronger recommendation of any system of election than that it at once protects the poor, and promotes in the rich an inoffensive and virtuous behaviour? Leave your elections open, and it cannot be doubted but that a general conspiracy of the nobles and the more wealthy commoners will be formed to influence them. I will not say they would succeed, but when I see to what perfection a system of corruption may be brought, I should fear

ear there was little probability of their failing. It might then be far more difficult than now to obtain the ballot: The fewer are the defects of your elective system, if once corrupted, the greater must be the difficulty of correcting it. Legislative corruption can only be removed when the people can be roused to call aloud for redress. The mass of the people can never be taught to discern the nicer shades, the subtleties and refinements of corruption. If in the present state of things, when all is rotten and stinking from the skin to the marrow, the people can be deluded by alarms at innovation, and shew but too much insensibility to the cause of reform, is it not to be expected that, after obtaining a reform called radical and complete by men renowned for wisdom and virtue, it might be utterly impracticable to animate them to a demand of any thing farther? On this ground it seems expedient to demand a ballot in the first instance.

From the first dawns of reform to this hour, I have invariably disapproved of a step-by-step system of reforming. From the first it required but a moderate portion of penetration to perceive, that so fast had the crown, the peerage, and the borough-mongers got the House of Commons in their gripe, that nought but serious apprehensions from the indignation of the people could possibly set it free. Every partial reform was as sure to be

resisted with their whole force as the most complete. But to propose partial reforms was to play into their hands. The most defective reform like the most perfect, must be the effect of fear.* When, therefore, you are in a condition to obtain either, you may have your option. But in order to put yourself into that condition, you must instruct and you must interest the people to a degree sufficiently extensive.

Your present plan approximates so nearly to true principles,† that it will meet, I doubt not, with great praise; but if it fail to call forth a popular energy equal to the object you have in view, I must enter a claim on behalf of the people, that the blame be not laid at their door. If in this case you would move the mass of mankind, away with all subtle reasonings to shew who ought and who ought not to be politically free; or in other words, who ought and who ought not to be represented in a legislature, which is to have power over the lives, liberties, and properties of all. You must follow nature, in speaking to all men the same language.

* The fear spoken of, is the fear of being thought by the whole nation, to be the patron of corruption, or a supporter of the usurpation of the Borough-mongers;—it is the fear of infamy, which ought to possess the breast of every man within the walls of Parliament.

† It extends the right of voting to all householders paying taxes, and gives annual elections.

It

It is sentiment and not reasoning on which you must depend. Your appeal must be to the common sense and to the heart of every human being. That faculty by which men are to apprehend that John shall elect, but Thomas shall not, is not *common* sense. The multitude must be made to feel and to sympathise. You must therefore adhere to nature, and touch those springs of sentiment which vibrate in every bosom. Nature knows no such distinctions as rich and poor.

Is it possible to peruse the gospel without being struck with the tender regard there paid to the poor? Did not the Great Reformer, by selecting teachers for mankind out of this class, mean to impress upon our minds a piece of important instruction? Was it not amongst the poor that he almost exclusively found the necessary virtue and freedom from prejudice for embracing his system? A system which, to the proud was a stumbling-block, and to the learned foolishness.* Philosophers had studied man: Christ knew him. If the poor man, in the eye of his Creator, be as precious

* Mr. *Burke* and Mr. *Wyndham* have always had too much dignity, learning, and philosophy to reason on the subject of representation, but in paradoxes, mysteries, and sublime nonsense. Contrast either of those gentlemen with *John Hardy*, and you will have a perfect counterpart of the Pharisee and the Fisherman of antiquity.

as the lord of wide possessions ; if his nature, his feelings, his faculties, and his moral duties be the same as those of the rich ; why is he to be degraded below the level of humanity ! God makes him a free agent : Shall his fellow take away his freedom ? God intrusts him with intellectual powers for the highest of all purposes, the happiness of a future state : and shall the use of these powers, in securing the greatest temporal blessing, be denied him by his brother ? God requires at his hands the fulfilment of every duty belonging to a moral and accountable being : And shall a mortal, frail as himself, tell him he is not fit to be trusted ?

Has not the Deity, by the diversities and different proportions of his gifts, absolutely ordained the inequality of possessions ; and by an irrevocable law of nature appointed some to rule, some to obey ; some to think, and some to act ; some to dispense employments, and some to labour ; while yet the eternal laws of justice and morality are to be observed ?—Shall man, then, imagine, that the system of the Deity is incomplete, and requires his aid ?—That it cannot be made the rule of practice, without his interference and amendment ? But what must we think of this interference, when it even professes to violate that sacred law of nature, *self defence* ? In the history of human society, have you any instance of the poor, while unoppressed

unoppressed or uninjured, systematically conspiring to change conditions with the rich, or to despoil them of their possessions? If the nature of man in any particular can be determined by the uniformity of his actions in all ages, the peaceable demeanor of the poor, while unoppressed, is to be relied on as a law of nature. Nay, they cannot be made to do otherwise, but by the extremes of injustice and cruelty. And even when occasionally roused to do themselves right, by the arts and eloquence of leaders, how feeble and ineffectual their efforts!

The incapacity of the poor, as such, from succeeding in any conspiracy against the rich, is founded in nature, and may be safely trusted to. They can effect no change of system, but by their collective force and by actual violence. It is therefore under despotic and unjust governments alone, that they are to be dreaded by the rich. Under such a system as you mean to establish by the proposed reform, the only step that can create any danger from them, is to exclude them from the full benefits of the system. But I am ready to concede, that our system of government, so far perfected as it would be under your plan, would free us from any danger on the part of the *poor*. Before they would be dangerous, their injuries must be much greater than under that system. My objection

jection is that you do not make them active friends. In neither case can they do you harm; but by embracing their rights on your plan, they may render you the most important services. I am, indeed, persuaded that on this very hinge may turn your whole chance of success. *If you do not take care to make the poor friends, prepare yourself for their being turned into enemies.* With Birmingham before your eyes, and associations for defence of the corruptions of government throughout the kingdom, can you doubt but that if all other contrivances fail, mobs may be excited to tear in pieces every reformer; unless you have the wisdom to establish, by your justice and your sacred regard to the political rights of the lower classes, a superior interest in their bosoms?*

You will perceive, Sir, that my convictions in favour of universal suffrage are in no degree weakened by the arguments you have offered against it. All those arguments indeed amount only to *exceptions* to the general principle; but

* I have just been well informed, that, some time ago, three coal-heavers were hired to attend one of the divisions of the Corresponding Society, in order to make a riot and produce violence. When the turbulence of their conduct betrayed their design, their attention was requested, and happily obtained. In a few minutes they were so convinced of the propriety and excellence of the views of the Society, that from that instant they became friends of freedom and reform, and remain so to this hour.

exceptions.

exceptions that are to exclude a large majority of the people from political liberty, are far too exceptionable to be admitted. I am surprised that with this consequence staring you in the face, you could possibly confide in your own reasonings, how specious soever. This is a sacred question, Sir; on which exceptions of any kind are to be entertained with extreme suspicion. Sifted to the bottom, I believe they will all be found not only unnecessary, but highly pernicious; and without doubt invidious in the extreme. The revenue officer, the domestic servant, and the day labourer, under protection of the ballot, will do more for the preservation of the constitution than all your persons of supposed independence in their open elections. In a country like this, where the executive establishment is immense, where weighty properties are numerous, and where connections of authority, interest and influence are infinite; pervading society in its minutest ramifications, very few indeed will be truly independent votes without the friendly shield of the ballot.

When the means of protection are so obvious, I know of no right, or principle of reason, whereby the tenant shall be required to throw himself out of his farm, or the shopkeeper to forfeit the custom of his wealthy neighbour, for merely doing his duty as a citizen. If the utility of the ballot be doubtful,

ful, the true way of deciding the question is by coupling it with the plan of reform, and canvassing the nation at large to know whether it be, or be not, the wish of the people to have it. But to return to your exceptions to the general principle of representation. In respect to the innocent and deserving pauper, I confess that I do not see any defect in his title; and I believe that, as an elector under the ballot, (if he gave himself the trouble to attend) he must prove perfectly harmless. To violate a sound principle by depriving him of his vote, would be to wound the cause of freedom more than he could wound it by any possible use he could make of his vote. It hurts me to notice these petty jealousies. Lay but your foundations on the broad basis of human nature, and what can you have to fear! It is by *protected numbers* that you must baffle corruption. Why, then, in the name of common sense, would you make *exceptions* or deny *protection*?

But without adopting the principle of exclusion, it will of course take place in the case of the vagabond. Every elector ought to be the *member* of some one certain *body* of electors. Then parochial elections, to be made by *the proper inhabitants* of each parish, inrolled for that special purpose, would in their own nature exclude all vagabonds and itinerants. Although a man ought to have his
right

right of suffrage, it follows not that he should have a claim to introduce confusion or inconsistency in the choice of legislators. Being once, whether householder or otherwise, enrolled as an elector of the parish of A in the division of B, of that elective body alone he should remain a member, until at his own expence and according to law, he should quit that division and become a member of some other.

I have said that legislative corruption can only be removed, when the people can be roused to call aloud for redress. You are equally sensible of this truth; but if you continue to adhere to the fatal error of *exclusions*, how can you possibly succeed! A great national reform in favour of our common liberties must depend on common sense, common sympathy, and a virtuous enthusiasm. The people must not only apprehend, but they must feel and glow. How will you limit your instruction to this or to that favoured class? And how will you confine to their bosoms all feeling and animation on the subject? As an orator, Sir, would you attempt to move an audience to deeds of exertion and courage for recovering a "*common right*" essential to freedom, by proposing it only to one half of them, and coupled with a condition that they excluded the other half as dangerous persons! No: no: no!

In

In attempting to save your country, Sir, copy the great Reformer who came to save a world. Let your benevolence embrace alike your whole species. Let your doctrines have the simplicity and the universality belonging to truths. They will then have its charms and make their way. But like the truths of the gospel, they will first be adopted by the poor. The powerful and proud revolt at reforms intended to raise the poor man from degradation. In such company, they disdain even to be saved. When the superstition and idolatry, the folly and iniquity which deluged the world were to be done away, and the greatest of earthly reforms to be brought about in the teeth of prejudice, false learning, pride and power; amongst what class of men were found that simplicity and independence of mind, that "freedom of choice" and competence of judgment," which alone could give success to the measure? Were they not almost exclusively found amongst the poor? Human nature is not altered. Amongst the poor were laid the first foundations of Christianity: amongst the poor must be laid the first foundations of a parliamentary reform.* But why need this be

* Candour requires I should acknowledge, that, upon enquiry, I have reason to believe, the major part of the members of reforming societies amongst the poor are *householders*. By the *poor*, I mean *generally* such as subsist from week to week by *personal* industry and labour; but sometimes I mean, as the context will shew, those below the degree of householder.

argued,

argued, when we have the example before our eyes? Where are there any beginnings of reform on a solid foundation, but amongst the societies formed from this class of men, and such as adopt the principle which embraces their rights? Their doctrine has taken root, and is silently spreading. No one of the other systems, proposed by the Delegates in 1780, by Mr. Pitt afterwards, or by any of the numerous writers on the subject, has made many converts, or maintained its ground against the neglect of the public, or the treachery and frowns of the great.

The society, Sir, of which you and I are members has not yet even established its own creed. If we think to combat the mighty confederacy against us by plans of political expediency; as well may we forbid the heavens to thunder, or the sun and moon to pursue their courses. We must settle our own faith on eternal principles of truth and natural right, before we can gain the well-disposed, or bring sinners to repentance. A faith resting on the broken reed of expediency, is no faith. What is expedient to-day may not be so to-morrow. The expediency of one man draws a line here; that of another a line there. To mere systems of expediency it is not in nature for the minds of the many to be uniformly or permanently attached. Why has the Deity so constituted things, that there should necessarily

cessarily exist *first principles* of truth and *rights of nature*; but that, when derangements have taken place, to them, and to them alone, should be made the final appeal, for preserving or restoring to man that free agency which is the proper element of a rational being. Give me, therefore, the unsophisticated feelings and the common sense of the shoemaker *John Hardy*, before all the metaphysical subtleties and the learned jargon of all the *Burkes* and *Wyndhams* that ever existed!"

It is now time we examined Mr. *Young's* mode of combating the doctrine of Personal Representation, or Universal Suffrage. The first bold stroke is utterly to deny, that the House of Commons either does, or ought to represent the Commons, "if by representation is meant choice." If this be granted, then it is ridiculous to distinguish between universal and partial suffrage: at one stroke, the whole is swept away. The members of that House, says he, "may be *accurately* described, without using the *word*, or referring to the *idea* of representation. To call them the representatives of the people is a very inaccurate mode of expression." This is plain English, and cannot be misunderstood.

Now mark the inconsistency of this gentleman. While *the people* are uppermost in his mind, the *word* representation is inaccurate and useless; and the

the very *idea* is to be discarded. But turn over only a few pages, and there you find both the word and the idea restored; for the purpose of expressing that to which they never can be *accurately* applied. "The principle of our constitution," says he, "is '*the representation of property*.'" (p. 106.)

This assertion is not quite so barefaced as the former; because it has great weight of prejudice in its favour, and even some authority; but authority against truth will not avail. Lord *Abingdon* quotes Lord *Camden* as saying, "That there was not a blade of grass in all *England* that was not represented."* But the word *grass* is here a figurative expression, signifying THE OWNERS of the grass. And so must be the word *property*, whenever connected with the idea of representation; otherwise it would be talking rank nonsense. The noble peer whom I have quoted, after arguing, to my apprehension, very incomprehensibly on the subject, is driven, by the nature of his premises,

* *Thoughts on the Letter of E. Burke, Esq. to the Sheriffs of Bristol*, 6th Edit. Introd. lxxv.

What might have been the original sentiments of Lord *Camden* on the subject I know not; but I have living testimony to shew, that his Lordship honoured an essay on the subject of a parliamentary reform founded on principles of personal representation, published in 1780, with much approbation of the most unequivocal nature, as he had no acquaintance with the author, but expressed it to a friend of his own, with whom the author afterwards became acquainted.

to this conclusion. " In the reign of *William* the
 " Norman, all the lands of the kingdom, which
 " was the only property, there being then no com-
 " merce, were in the possession of seven hundred
 " people only; and THEREFORE they, in their
 " *collective* capacity, not only composed *the whole*
 " *legislature*, but *engrossed the whole civil authority*
 " of the kingdom into their hands." Thus it
 seems that his Lordship first struck on the rock of
 nonsense, and was finally wrecked on that of des-
 potism.*

If this, then, be a legitimate issue of what these
 authors *call* a representation of *property*, God for-
 bid that such a doctrine should ever again take root
 in *England*! But what they *call* a representation
 of property, is in truth no such thing; but a par-
 tial representation of those who possess that parti-
 cular property, to the occupancy of which the pre-
 sent iniquitous and absurd regulations attach a right
 of voting; and consequently it ends in that in
 which all human representation must end—*personal*
 representation,—but then it is of a few only; and
 the final result of the mystery of iniquity—of the
 hocus-pocus of national election is—that after the

* See *The People's Barrier*, &c. p. 6 and 7. for the absurdity
 and fatal consequences of making *property* the foundation of re-
 presentation. See also *Holcroft's Narrative*, p. 40, where Lord
Abingdon's prejudice in favour of the doctrine is well accounted
 for.

House of Commons, by a gross fiction, is supposed to be chosen by the millions, a decided majority of its members is nominated and appointed by *one hundred and fifty-four men* ;* who consequently are in effect, according to Mr. *Young*, the JOINT SOVEREIGNS of the country ; for, says he, “ Examine “ the House of Commons in whatever light you “ will, and it will be found to possess, in the power “ of the purse, so enormous an authority, that the “ other branches of the legislature are absolutely “ at its mercy.” (p. 92.)

It was against this dangerous and destructive power of the HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR, that the doctrine of universal suffrage was first brought into the field ; and it is in support of the impudent usurpation of those men, that Mr. *Young* now combats the doctrine, and attacks its friends with all the bitterness of invective. In general, the invective is so gross, and the inconsistency so glaring, that strong must be the previous prejudices in the minds of his readers, for them not to revolt at his assertions, and disagree in his conclusions : but, by the aid of satyric powers, and a glow of eloquence, he sometimes gives his animated declamation a semblance of argument ; and perhaps in no instances more, than where he touches on *personal re-*

* As offered to be proved at the Bar of the House of Commons on the 6th of May, 1793, by certain Petitioners, of whom I shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

presentation. But a little sober attention and cool reasoning will I trust shew, that all the evils and horrors in *France*, which Mr. *Young* has so confidently imputed to *personal representation*, might with just as much propriety have been imputed to man's walking on two legs; or being without wings. The cause and the effect do not agree. Let us examine his most prominent cases.

After a few introductory pages, his discourse begins with a picture of the French government towards the close of the year 1792; representing it as divided between the Jacobin clubs, the councils of the commons, the nominal convention, and the *Paris* mob; and producing documents in proof of the fact. He then proceeds; "The commissioners of the sections at *Paris*, at the bar of the Convention, bully it in these terms: 'The time presses—the storm forms itself.'—Thus overturning the government that had been formed on *the rights of man*, which, instead of yielding peace and tranquillity, produced storms only, the *eternal* products of *such* revolutions; and the blood that had been so lavishly spilled for the *public repose*, afforded so little, that the minister *Rolland*, writing to the Commons of *Paris*, says, *I hear of nothing but conspiracies*,

* A singular declaration, from one who must recollect the American Revolution, which, amongst themselves, was not attended with a single storm of any kind.

" and

“ *and projects of murder and assassination. Tho*
“ *wicked preached yesterday, at the same moment, in*
“ *different parts of Paris, pillage and assassination.*
“ And being ordered by the Convention to report
“ the state of *Paris*, his expression is, *the adm-*
“ *istrative bodies, without powers; the commons*
“ *despotic; the people deceived;—such is Paris!*
“ But deceived and ignorant as they were, they
“ thought their *lights* sufficient to instruct the no-
“ minal legislature; as *Marat* and his gang were
“ daily declaring, that cutting off heads was the
“ *genuine employment of a people*, and denouncing
“ so many members of the Convention in the Ja-
“ cobin clubs, it was debated in the Convention,
“ whether a guard ought not to be drawn from all
“ the eighty-three departments. On this project,
“ the commissioners of the forty-eight sections of
“ *Paris* thus speak (Oct. 19) to the Convention:”
“ Proxies of the Sovereign! you see before you
“ the deputies of the sections of *Paris*. They
“ come to make you understand eternal truths.
“ No words—but things! It is proposed to place
“ you on a level with tyrants—to surround you
“ with a distinct guard. The sections of *Paris*,
“ weighing the principles on which the sovereignty
“ of the people resides, declare to you that this
“ project is odious and dangerous. We will attack
“ in front such a principle. What audaciousness,
“ to conjecture that the people will consent to such

“ a decree! What! they propose to you constitutional decrees, before the existence of the constitution! Wait till the law exists, and the people have sanctioned it. *Paris* has made the revolution. *Paris* has given liberty to the rest of France.* *Paris* knows how to maintain it.”

* “ In regard to the future consequences of this singular revolution; as an *example* to other nations, there can be no doubt but *the spirit which has produced it* will, sooner or later, spread throughout *Europe*, according to the different degrees of *illumination* amongst the common people; and it will prove either mischievous or beneficial, in proportion to the previous steps taken by governments.” *Young’s Travels*, p. 548.

—“ if a starving populace were not in question, no one would dream of moving. This confirms what I have often heard remarked, that the *deficit* would not have produced the revolution but in concurrence with the price of bread. *Does not this shew the infinite consequence of great cities to the liberty of mankind? Without Paris, I question whether the present Revolution, which is fast working in France, could possibly have had an origin.* It is not in the villages of *Syria* or *Diarbekir* that the Grand Seigneur meets with a murmur against his will; it is at *Constantinople* that he is obliged to manage and mix caution even with despotism.” *Young’s Travels*, p. 137.

“ Companies at a coffee-house at *Moulins*, numerous enough to fill twenty tables, and curiosity not active enough to command one paper. What impudence and folly!—Folly in the customers of such a house not to insist on half a dozen papers, and all the journals of the Assembly; and impudence of the woman not to provide them! Could such a people as this ever have made a revolution, or become free? Never, in a thousand centuries: *The enlightened mob of Paris*, amidst hundreds of papers and publications, have done the whole.” *Young’s Travels*, p. 157.

Here

“ Here *Paris* expressly declares to the Convention, that their decrees were waste paper, till the people sanction them: *such is personal representation*; an assembly so elected, and the people no sooner possess such representatives, than, intoxicated with power, they declare their deputies things of straw, and their decrees null, till sanctioned by the people themselves !” (p. 10.)

That Mr. *Young* has here described an anarchy, I grant; for in this portrait there is no feature of a government either well understood, supported, or obeyed. Neither is there either evidence or pretence—his own excepted—that the doctrine of personal representation was the *cause* of this anarchy. As well might Mr. *Byron* have attributed to the principle of personal representation the general *mutiny*, the various *factions*, and the consequent *anarchy* amongst the crew of the *Centurion* after their shipwreck on the coast of *Chili*. Amongst people entertaining a strong sense either of natural or political liberty, the wreck either of a ship or of a state, dissolving former government, is but too likely to produce divisions, jealousies, and a struggle for power, whether a system of representation was ever heard of amongst them or not.

Anarchy on such an occasion can only be prevented by the operation of some powerful cause or

causes, winning the consents, or over-ruling the opposition of men to an early adoption and firm establishment of a new rule of government. Those causes may either be found in the baseness of the people, or in their high-mindedness; in their ignorance of the science of civil government, particularly of the principle of representation, or in their superior knowledge of that science and that principle: nor must we lay out of the account the licentiousness or the sobriety of their morals. And in proportion as the people are ill informed and licentious in their morals, or the contrary, have ambitious and unprincipled demagogues the opportunity of deceiving and enslaving them, or enlightened patriots the means of establishing their freedom on a rock.

What have the ignorant and base *Asiatics* ever obtained from a revolution, but a change of tyrants! Anarchy amongst them was prevented by despotism. Amongst the *Romans*, anarchy and civil war *preceded* their revolution; which, in consequence of their ignorance of civil government, (for to them the true nature of *legislative representation* was unknown,) enabled the crafty *Augustus* to lay the foundations of that imperial despotism which has proved so destructive and so lasting a scourge to *Europe*; and under the dregs of which the nations yet groan. The three eagles which tore out the bowels of devoted *Poland*, and
which

which still lead the three most potent armies of despotism, are all the progeny of the imperial eagle of ancient *Rome*.

By a comparative ignorance amongst the *English*, was *Cromwell* enabled to end a revolution, by seizing to himself the sovereign power; but yet he stood so far in awe of their comparative knowledge, that he did not annihilate the form of parliament; and in the end he left the foundations of liberty much as he found them. By their improved experience and knowledge in 1688, they profited considerably by the revolution of that period: but still fell far short of political security; as the triennial and septennial acts, rotten-borough representation, a ruinous debt, and some *et cetera* but too clearly demonstrate.

The case of *America* is all that I shall add. It is in point to shew that *personal representation*, so far from being a natural cause of anarchy, is, when rightly understood, the most complete specific against that popular phrensy. Although suffrage in *America* is only universal in one or two states, yet, that *political liberty* is intended and understood to be universal,* no man would think of denying; and in the state of *New York*, where I believe the right of

* With the exception only as to the black slaves in a few of the Southern States,

suffrage is as much limited by a qualification as any where, I have the highest authority in this country for stating, that such qualification does not exclude more than one man in two hundred.* From these facts, as representation underwent but little variation in consequence of the American Revolution, it must appear that if a principle of personal representation had a natural tendency to produce anarchy, there more than any where it might have been expected.

Now, what was the fact?—It was this: Their invariable experience of the wisdom and efficacy, the peace and security of governments founded on personal representation, would not suffer them, on the dissolution of those governments by the war and the declaration of independence, to trust, even in the moments of revolution, to any other species of

* How striking the contrast between *New York* and *Great Britain*!—"Your Petitioners complain, that the Elective Franchise is so partially and unequally distributed, and in so many places committed to bodies of men of such very limited numbers, that the majority of your honourable House is elected by less than fifteen thousand electors, which, even if the male adults in the kingdom be estimated at so low a number as three millions, is not more than the *two hundredth* part of the people to be represented."—*Petition of 6th May, 1793.*

But when these *nominal* electors are condensed into the mere instruments of the ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR, it will be found that those who make a majority of the House are placed there at the will of very nearly *one in ten thousand*.

govern-

government whatever. All their temporary expedients were on this sole principle. They did not in a single instance deviate into any other. *Committees* were every where the representative Bodies which transacted all business. So that when they were without a government, instead of being torn by factions and anarchy, they manifested only union and energy. Like naked *Eve*—“when unadorned, adorned the most”—the *Americans*, when stripped of the political garb of civil rule, appeared with the greater lustre, enrobed in political wisdom and virtue. Or we may ascribe to the principle of personal representation, which may be called *the political law of nature*, in the minds of the *Americans*, that which *Paul* so beautifully ascribes to *the moral law of nature*, in the minds of good men not having the advantage of revelation; and say that, *wanting a constitutional law, they were a law to themselves*. After what has been said, it may be superfluous to add, that during the whole progress of that revolution, not a single drop of American blood was shed by American hands.

Now, had the situation of *France* been similar to that of *America*, there can be no doubt but that the principle of personal representation would there also have had similar effects; and proved a cause all-powerful to have won the consents, and over-ruled the

the opposition of men, to an early and peaceable adoption, and firm establishment, of a new rule of government, when she was determined to throw off that which had been tried. But in almost every particular were the cases of *America* and *France* dissimilar; and in many instances the reverse. Their only agreement was in that love of liberty which is common to the whole human species;* while in the habits, the experience, and the knowledge necessary to its attainment or preservation, they were extremely wide asunder. With this natural desire of liberty, this single advantage towards the prevention of anarchy and the speedily settling under a new rule of government, *France* had so many disadvantages to contend with, and so many difficulties to overcome, that how she survived the conflict of her own intestine divisions is matter of astonishment. And when we find that that grand passion, a love of freedom, has not only borne her through that struggle to her present

* See Mr. *Young's* comparison, between the cases of *America* and *France*; *Travels*, p. 551 and 555; which end with these words, "Such remarks, however, ought always to be accompanied with an admission, that the British government has been experimented.—With what result?—Let a debt of 240 millions," [now above 300] "—let seven wars—let *Bengal* and *Gibraltar*—let thirty millions sterling of national burthens, taxes, rates, tythes, and monopolies—let these answer."

N. B. The whole rental of Great Britain has never been estimated at much more than twenty millions per annum.

comparatively settled state; but has, at the same time, like the explosion of a mine, smitten and dispersed her potent enemies in all directions, we can only exclaim—Great are thy energies, O liberty!

In assigning the causes of *Parisian* anarchy at the close of the year 1792, to overlook the extinction at one stroke, of perhaps the most numerous and wealthy popish priesthood in Europe;—to overlook the abolition of nobility, where recently two or three hundred thousand noblese* had been in the habit of tyrannizing over a despised people;—to overlook the numerous partizans of monarchy, where monarchy had so lately been idolized;—to overlook all the seeds of confusion from the retainers, dependants and expectants of the yet unabolished court;—to overlook the hostility of abolished judicatures, where a numerous herd of sagacious blood-suckers had been accustomed to fatten by the open sale of justice;—to overlook the animosities engendered by the slaughter on the 10th of August, and the massacres of September;—to overlook the money of *Egalité* so publicly employed to create a distinct faction;†—to overlook also the money and the intrigues, the agents

* Although *Paris* was the scene of the anarchy, the causes were as extended as the defects in the former government.

† “ And the majority obtained by the menaces of the assassins paid by *Egalité*,” p. 97.

agents and incendiaries of half a dozen foreign courts :—to overlook the infinite suspicions and jealousies arising from so many powerful causes, and driving the heated minds of the people almost to madness ;—to overlook the personal ambition of a vast body of new men, distinguished for talents and learning, indignantly rising from a hated servitude to rule an empire, and contending for superiority ;
—to

Turin, Sept. 25th, 1789.—“ I was in time for the table d’hôte, at which were several French refugees, whose accounts of affairs in *France* are dreadful. These were driven from their chateaus, some of them in flames ; it gave me an opportunity of inquiring by whom such enormities were committed ; by the peasants, or wandering brigands ? they said, by peasants, undoubtedly ; but that *the great and indisputable origin of most of those villanies*, was the settled plan and conduct of some leaders in the National Assembly, in union with, and by the MONEY of *one other person of great rank*, who would deserve the eternal execrations and reproaches of all true Frenchmen and every honest man : that when the Assembly had rejected the proposal of the Count de Mirabeau, to address the King to establish the *milice bourgeoise* ; couriers were soon after sent to all quarters of the kingdom, to give an universal alarm of great troops of *brigands* being on the actual march, plundering and burning every where, at the instigation of aristocrats, and calling on the people to arm immediately in their defence ; that by intelligence afterwards received from different parts of the kingdom, it was found, that these couriers must have been dispatched from *Paris* at the same time ; and afterwards at *Paris* *this fact was confirmed to me*. Forged orders of the King in Council were likewise sent, directing the people to burn the chateaus of the aristocratical party ; and thus, as it were by magic, all *France* was armed at the same moment,
and

—to overlook the unsettled and uninstructed state of the public mind, on the true principles and nature of political liberty, overpowered perhaps by a flood of light poured upon it too copiously and too rapidly ;—to overlook the loose morals and licentiousness in the populace of a vast city, become the sink of every vice, which centuries of *voluptuousness nourished by despotism* could produce ;—to overlook the inward ferocity of a people, amongst whom the detestable executions of the old government had been an ordinary spectacle of polite circles ;*—and finally to overlook all the bitter personal

and the peasants instigated to commit the enormities which have since disgraced the kingdom." *Young's Travels*, p. 194.

The author somewhere notices another *fact*, explanatory of the arts of *Egalité*, for keeping alive the disturbances in *Paris*. It was to furnish the shops with great store of squibs and crackers, and enabling them to sell them to the populace very far below the prime cost.—But now, forsooth, nothing but the principle of *personal representation*, or *political liberty*, extending the motives and interests of tranquillity to every bosom, is to be supposed capable of producing anarchy and mischief ! Wonderful are thy powers, O Logic ! Mr. *Young* forgets to prove, that *personal representation* produced those riots in 1780, by which *London* was so near being destroyed. He forgets also to shew us, that the burnings and plunderings at *Birmingham* in 1791, proceeded from the same cause ; or that the mob was infected by *Jacobin* principles. See Appendix, No. II.

* An usual prelude to an execution, was putting a criminal to the question. His hands being tied together behind his body, a perpendicular

sonal revenges which must have been the fruitful consequences of the late wrongs and insulting oppressions;—to overlook, I say, all these and other causes of the anarchy complained of, and to lay the whole blame on the adoption of the principle of *personal representation*, or in other words, the principle of *political liberty*, is perhaps the boldest and most unblushing attempt in the cause of delusion, that any man was ever hardy enough to make in the face of a public.

But

perpendicular rope coming from a pulley above was tied to his wrists. By this rope he was drawn up to a considerable height, the whole weight of his body borne by the joints of his arms in their weakest position. The rope was then suddenly loosened, to give the man the most rapid descent, but ere he reached the ground! stopped with a jerk, so that the whole weight of the body descending with velocity and falling on the shoulder joints, his arms were instantly wrenched out of the sockets, and twisted over his head. Thus far, the process had no other object but to make the criminal *speak truth*. Execution was as follows. The sufferer was extended on a wooden cross laid horizontally on a stage, in front of a semi-amphitheatre of benches, filled with what in polished societies is called *the best company*; where *the fair sex of all ages* made a conspicuous part. The suffering wretch being bound on the cross with cords, the executioner, conscious of the eyes that were upon his every attitude, gracefully waved aloft his horrid weapon, a heavy flatted bar of iron resembling a sword. In its descent it mashed a leg or an arm. Then with due deliberation, and regarding more the eyes of the spectators than the cries of his fellow-creature on the cross, he proceeded regularly to walk round the howling, writhing, agonizing object of *despotic justice*,
breaking

But according to Mr. *Young*, no argument in favour of personal representation drawn from *America* will hold, because she has not yet “ a numerous “ and indigent poor, and, she is therefore exempt “ from the great difficulty of all government.”— And he proceeds a few lines lower to add,—“ To

breaking each arm and each leg in two places. With the shoulder joints thus dislocated, and with his mangled limbs thus broken in eight places, the quivering sufferer was then laid upon an horizontal wheel at the corner of the stage, his broken legs and arms dangling between the spokes; and by *despotic mercy* there left to expire by the slow torments of so many cruelties, thirst, and fever.

If such diabolical exhibitions had given a tincture of infernalism to the public mind, how can we be surprized, that men educated in such a school should not be backward in shedding blood?—How can we even say, that those who had authorized and supported such hellish modes of governing, met not a just *retribution* when their own blood was shed?—And how can we sufficiently execrate *despotic power*, which necessarily converts man into every thing that is brutal and bestial! What was it but a taste for letters, the use of the press, and some glimmering of christianity, counteracting this natural tendency of government, that made Frenchmen what they were, in respect of knowledge, politeness and general humanity.

“ Thus it may be said, perhaps with truth, that the fall of the king, court, lords, nobles, army, church, and parliaments, is owing to a want of intelligence being quickly circulated, consequently is owing to the very effects of *that thralldom in which they held the people*: it is therefore A RETRIBUTION RATHER THAN A PUNISHMENT.” *Young's Travels*, p. 147.

“suppose that the mob will possess the sovereign authority in act as well as in right, AND RE-MAIN HUNGRY, is a farce.” The author had just quoted an able American writer who says, “The truth is, that in our governments the supreme, absolute, and uncontrouled power remains in the PEOPLE; as our constitutions are superior to our legislature, so the people are superior to the constitutions. Indeed the superiority in this last instance is much greater; for the people possess, over our constitutions, controul in act, as well as in right.”*—Now if the controul of the people was not in *act*, but merely in *right*, there would be no more efficacy in a people than a parchment; and if the people did not, by *the fullness and freedom of their suffrages, and their annual elections*, effectually controul and overawe their legislatures; those legislatures would soon degenerate into the same corrupt instruments of faction or despotism as the legislatures of other countries have done.

According to the spirit in which *The Example of France a Warning to Britain* is written, it was necessary that what Dr. Wilson called the *people*, Mr. Young should call the *mob*. Now, whatever may have been the experience of nations, prior to the

* *Example of France*, &c. p. 61.

present age, respecting a "numerous and indigent poor," that calamitous effect of misgovernment, is most likely to be prevented by such constitutions as those of the several American States; in which the law of primogeniture is unknown, and in which also the people are almost universally represented. I know that *Smith* has, with much ability, shewn how the progressive operation of what is called *improvement*, tends to produce in the end "a numerous and indigent poor;" but such a circumstance being doubtless a *disease* in the body politic, to know the causes should enable wise legislatures to prevent the effect; and it should seem that legislative wisdom might prevent such a disease, at least until every habitable region of this globe should be stocked with inhabitants equal to its means of support; a period apparently at the distance of many centuries. And should such a period ever arrive, it may reasonably be hoped, that the benevolent Creator of man will stretch out his almighty arm to avert a calamity so dreadful, as that of a population too great for subsistence on the earth. And this consideration may add some strength to prophecy, which intimates that *time* shall have an end; meaning that *that portion of eternity* which commenced, and shall end, with the arrangements made for the accommodation of man on earth, is to be succeeded by some great change in nature.

INTRODUCTION.

But to keep a little nearer home, we may say, that systems of government which shall not in future prevent the mass of a people from being driven by HUNGER to acts of outrage, will not deserve the name of government; and that no other system can be so effectual to that end, as that in which a whole people enjoy *political liberty*, secured to them by *personal representation*, is a conclusion so obvious, a dictate of common sense so powerful, that muddy indeed must be the understanding in which a doubt can be entertained on the subject. He who denies it must deny rationality to belong to man, and level the human species with the irrational orders of existence. Real HUNGER is so dreadful an evil, and when not a consequence of crimes, so complete a justification for seizing by force the means of subsistence, that it is astonishing how any man can contend for the power of a state being so placed, and so fortified, that it shall be possible for rulers and others to feast, while a great proportion of the people shall be compelled to bear an evil so insupportable. Can there be a stronger argument in favour of giving political liberty to all, than that their rulers never could bring upon them such a calamity?

The nations where many are *hungry*, while many others are rioting in excess, will do well to revise
their

INTRODUCTION.

ci

their systems, and to apply suitable remedies to their disorder. At the same time that the extremes of wealth and indigence are a great evil, none but the insane will think of correcting it, by an absolute and forced equality; a condition utterly impossible to be maintained, except amongst savage tribes thinly scattered in woods and wildernesses.

France, by the operation of a strong necessity, has been compelled to apply, perhaps much farther than free inclination led her, a corrective to extreme inequality; but so far as we have grounds for judging, she will not, when her Revolution is completed and Peace restored to her, be likely to go any farther towards preventing an excess of inequality, than effectually to do away the principle of primogeniture, and to leave property as free as water; Water accumulates wherever receptacles detain the descending rains; it frequently overflows, and causes great but temporary inequalities; but by the operation of necessary causes, it constantly tends to its more regular divisions of seas, lakes and rivers; no less than to rivulets, brooks, rills and dews; and by its *natural* circulation, throughout the regions of earth, sea and air, it refreshes and preserves all nature in health and beauty. Similar are the proper effects, in political society,

when PROPERTY is left to take its uncontrouled circulation.—Although there must be a natural tendency towards equality, that tendency must ever be counteracted by other more powerful causes; and the utmost degree of equality attainable, will still leave to nations happily situated, happily governed, and rich by nature, inexhaustible oceans of wealth; while amongst individuals of the same nature, we shall always see as much inequality as the happiness of the whole can require.

Mr. *Young* very wisely pronounces that the experiment on the American system of *personal representation* cannot be decided until “she has a numerous and indigent poor,” which, if the foregoing reasoning has any weight, is likely to be deferred till *the end of time*. But seeing what that system of personal representation actually produced during the very convulsions of a revolution, and what complete freedom has since been enjoyed under it for nearly twenty years, he might in his candour have allowed it *some small share of credit*; had not the utter subversion of *political liberty* been the object of his writing. Of his candour we have also remarkable specimens in the terms in which he speaks of the *French* experiment on personal representation; an experiment which it surely would be ridiculous to say is yet decided, or can be decided, until the convulsions which have subsisted from

INTRODUCTION.

ciii

from the commencement of the Revolution, shall terminate is a settled government of some kind or other.—“ If personal representation,” says he, “ has, in the short period of four years, given the “ government of *France* into the hands of the mob “ — with two legislative bodies in succession most “ completely devoid of property; and if the con- “ sequence has been the destruction of property, “ and the delivery of its possessors to be butchered “ or banished, we are surely justified in asserting, “ that THE EXPERIMENT OF PERSONAL REPRESENTATION HAS BEEN MADE AND TOTALLY FAILED.” p. 61.

Again:—“ To answer that this anarchy may “ subside, and produce a good government at “ last, is so completely beside the question, reasoning on facts, that I am astonished to hear it so “ often recurred to; THE EXPERIMENT OF THE “ NEW GOVERNMENT IN FRANCE WAS COMPLETE—IT WAS PUNISHED—DECREED AND ACCEPTED—It is farcical to suppose that *Louis XVI.* “ had more power to sap and destroy it than any “ other king: if it could not go on with him, it” [the government by personal representation, *alias*, of *political liberty*, if the question be not shifted] “ could not go on at all, and therefore was rotten “ at heart.”

More farcical assertions I believe never were made, than these of Mr. *Young*, telling us in contradiction to our senses, that the French experiment is decided; while the powers of Europe are yet in the act of attempting to defeat it by arms, and while Mr. *Young* himself, their powerful ally, is every day exercising the artillery of the pen, and the ammunition of ink, in the same wise attempt. But if this gentleman were not infected with the fashionable disorder, a *shortness of memory*, he might have recollected other causes for the butchery and banishment of men of property in France, than *personal representation*. "It is impossible," said Mr. *Young*, in May 1792, "to justify the excesses of
" the people on their taking up arms; they were
" certainly guilty of cruelties; it is idle to deny
" the facts, for they have been proved too clearly
" to admit of a doubt. But is it really the people
" to whom we are to impute the whole?—Or to
" their oppressors, who had kept them so long in
" a state of bondage? He who chooses to be served
" by slaves, and by ill-treated slaves, must know
" that he holds his property and life by a tenure
" far different from those who prefer the service of
" well-treated free-men; and he who dines to the
" music of groaning sufferers, must not, in the
" moment of insurrection, complain that his
" daughters are ravished, and then destroyed; and
" that his sons throats are cut. When such evils
" happen,

“ happen, they surely are more imputable to the
 “ tyranny of the master, than to the cruelty of the
 “ servant. The analogy holds with the French
 “ peasants—the murder of a seigneur, or a chateau
 “ in flames, is recorded in every newspaper; the
 “ rank of the person who suffers attracts notice;
 “ but where do we find the register of that seig-
 “ neur’s oppressions of his peasantry, and his ex-
 “ actions of feudal services, from those whose
 “ children were dying around them for want of
 “ bread? Where do we find the minutes that as-
 “ signed these starving wretches to some vile petty-
 “ fogger, to be fleeced by impositions, and a
 “ mockery of justice, in the seigneurial courts?
 “ Who gives us the awards of the intendant and
 “ his *sub-delegués*, which took off the taxes of a
 “ man of fashion, and laid them with accumulated
 “ weight on the poor, who were so unfortunate as
 “ to be his neighbours? Who has dwelt sufficiently
 “ upon explaining *all the ramifications of despotism*,
 “ *regal,* aristocratical, and ecclesiastical*, pervading
 “ the whole mass of the people; *reaching, like a*
 “ *circulating fluid, the most distant capillary tubes of*
 “ *poverty and wretchedness*? In these cases, the
 “ sufferers are too ignoble to be known; and the
 “ mass too indiscriminate to be pitied. But should
 “ *a philosopher* feel and reason thus? Should *he*

* This was written, and properly, while the author was not
 ignorant of the personal character of *Louis*.

“ mistake

“ mistake the cause for the effect ? And giving all
“ his pity to the few, feel no compassion for the
“ many, because they suffer in his eyes not in-
“ dividually, but *by millions* ? The excesses of
“ the people cannot, I repeat, be justified ; it
“ would undoubtedly have done them credit, both
“ as men and christians, if they had possessed their
“ new acquired power with moderation. But let
“ it be remembered, that the populace in no coun-
“ try ever use power with moderation ; excess is
“ inherent in their aggregate constitution : and as
“ every government in the world knows, that vio-
“ lence infallibly attends power in such hands, it
“ is doubly bound in common sense, and for
“ common safety, so to conduct itself, that the
“ people may not find an interest in public con-
“ fusions. *They will always suffer much and long,*
“ before they are effectually roused ; nothing,
“ therefore, can kindle the flame, but such op-
“ pressions of some classes or other in the society,
“ as give able men the opportunity of seconding
“ the general mass ; discontent will soon diffuse
“ itself around ; and *if the government take not*
“ *warning in time, it is alone answerable for all the*
“ *burnings, and plunderings, and devastation, and*
“ *blood that follow.* The true judgment to be
“ formed of the French revolution, must surely
“ be gained, from *an attentive consideration of the*
“ *evils of the old government* : when these are well
“ understood

“ understood—and when *the extent and universality*
 “ of the oppression under which the people groaned
 “ —*oppression which bore upon them from every*
 “ *quarter*, it will scarcely be attempted to be
 “ urged, that a revolution was not necessary to
 “ the welfare of the kingdom. Not one opposing
 “ voice can, with reason, be raised against this
 “ assertion.”* &c.

The same gentleman on the 11th January, 1790,
 wrote as follows :

“ They have no scruple in declaring, that a well-
 “ concerted vigorous effort would place him”
 [the king] “ at the head of a powerful army,
 “ which could not fail of being joined by a great,
 “ disgusted, and injured body. I remarked that
 “ *every honest man* must hope no such event would
 “ take place ; for *if a counter-revolution should be*
 “ *effected*, IT WOULD ESTABLISH A DESPOTISM,
 “ MUCH HEAVIER THAN EVER FRANCE EXPERI-
 “ ENCED.”†

In a subsequent part of his work, he enumerates,
 from knowledge collected on the spot, and for
 which he produces a host of authorities, a long
catalogue of oppressions which cannot be read without
 inexpressible horror and indignation; and then after

* *Travels*, p. 538. † *Ibid.* 269.

doing justice to the French clergy, respecting the mildness with which they collected their *tithes*—a justice, he says, “to which a claim cannot be laid “in *England*,” he proceeds; “But mild as it was, “the burthen to people groaning under *so many* “other oppressions, united to render their situation “so bad THAT NO CHANGE COULD BE FOR THE “WORSE. But these were not all the evils with “which the people struggled. THE ADMINI- “STRATION OF JUSTICE WAS PARTIAL, VENAL, “INFAMOUS.”* &c. &c. &c.

And was this the same pen which, within a few months after the publication of these declarations, could write the following words;—“THE ABSOLUTE AND UNEQUIVOCAL RESTORATION OF THE “OLD GOVERNMENT, WITH TERRORS IN ITS “TRAIN, NOT THE BENEFICENCE OF LOUIS XVI. “SEEMS NOW TO BE THE ONLY REMEDY!”†—And was this the pen that could so soon become the panegyrist of that detestable government, it had so recently painted in the most odious colours; and the satyrist of those who, having received the impression, expressed the sentiments it inspired!—Did not its ink turn red with shame while writing as follows;—“Such has been the attention to personal liberty, under the reign of philosophers,

* *Travels*, p. 537.

† *Example of France a Warning to Britain*, p. 134.

“established on the ruin of *the mildest and most*
“*benignant government in Europe*, our own only
“excepted; a government *cruelly libelled* by one
“of our reforming orators,* who thus describes it;
“a species of government that trampled on the
“property, the liberty, and the lives of its subjects;
“that dealt in extortions, dungeons, and tortures;
“and that prepared before hand, a day of sangui-
“nary vengeance!”†

That a strong effervescence of that genuine liberty which universal suffrage implies, was apparent in the struggles during the winter of 1792, is the sole ground on which Mr. *Young* had to build his unfounded charge. The less such true liberty was understood by its real friends, the more of course it would fail of its proper effect: and the more powerfully it was counteracted by the potent causes I have noticed, the less in like manner could it manifest its natural tendency to prevent anarchy. Political liberty being the grand prize, the object of some, and the pretended object of all, it stands in the fore ground, and forcibly arrests our attention; and it therefore required but little dexterity to make it appear to have been the *cause* of the anarchy that has been spoken of. And here Mr. *Young* falls

* Mr. Sheridan.

† *Example of France a Warning to Britain*, p. 33.

into an error.—I hope it is an error—not uncommon to heated imaginations when employed on abstruse reasoning: By naming the *cause* instead of the *effect*, he confounds his reader and perhaps puzzled himself. The political liberty of all communities too large for *personal legislation*, is the *effect* of which *personal representation* is only the *cause*. Hence we shall perceive that all the shafts apparently pointed at the *cause*, are in truth aimed at the *effect*. If *personal representation* be hunted down and destroyed, *political liberty* is no more. And if error the most unaccountable and self delusive the most astonishing, have not bewildered the author of *The Example of France a Warning to Britain*, the utter extinction of political liberty in this country is the object manifest in every page of that book.

The demonstration of what constitutes political liberty lies in a nut-shell. But demonstration, I presume is amongst “those infamies of abstract and ideal perfection,” with which Mr. Young is determined to have nothing to do.* I have already given the demonstration in effect; but it shall be repeated in another form. *In a community too extensive for personal legislation, to be politically free, every man must have personal representation, that is; every man must have a right to vote in the electing of legislators.* He who has not *such* representation,

* See page xxii.

may possibly have *protection*, wealth, and other *enjoyments*; and so may the wealthy merchant of *Mysore*; the *Siberian* Chief; or the *Jamaica* Negro; but he has not *political liberty*. Freedom without *choice*; a free agent without a *will*; and representation without *election*; are refinements which the understandings of an English public will not easily be made to comprehend; but these sublime mysticisms, these insults to common sense, which the understanding cannot comprehend, we may learn, it seems, by the aid of a little political fanaticism, to believe and to reverence. Mr. *Young* who, on his miraculous conversion in 1792, was favoured with an inward light and a powerful inspiration, has a ready answer to all our plain English and sober convictions of mind. According to him, "We **FEEL** that we are free under this constitution." (p. 83.) On this occasion it is natural to ask who besides our Borough-mongers, Placemen and Pensioners, are comprehended in the word **WE**? It would not have been necessary to have written a book of more than 250 pages, for the purpose of communicating this feeling, had it not been plain there were many in want of it. Now I know but of two modes of conversion from error. One is by miracle, inward light, or inspiration; the other, by reason and argument. But Mr. *Young* withholds from us both, which is unkind. For not attempting to communicate his inward light, I do not blame him. He may, in his own person, have a
con-

consciousness of a miraculous conversion without the power of working miracles himself. But, being the apostle, who labours more abundantly than all the rest, we might have expected that he would not have been sparing in producing reasons for the faith that is in him.

When the Reformers say—"Give us our Rights;"—he replies, that this "is an expression which has been used with singular emphasis; the reply once proper, was an abstract reasoning on the nature of those rights: we have now something much surer to direct our judgments; and can answer, with strict reference to the facts that govern the question, you have your rights; you are in possession of every right that is consistent with safety to the life and property of others—to give you more will endanger both—to give you *much* more will infallibly destroy them, and eventually yourselves. You have, therefore, ALL your rights; for you have all that is consistent with your happiness; and those who associate to gain more, seek, by means which they know to be the high road to confusion, to seize what is NOT their right, at the expence of crimes similar to those that have destroyed the first kingdom of the world."* (p. 67.)

* "My argument was an Appeal to the English Constitution; take it at once, which is the business of a single vote; by your possession of a *real and equal representation of the people*, you have freed it from its *only great objection*," *Young's Travels*, p. 127.

Now

Now all this, according to Mr. *Young's* new inward light, -by which he discovers national representation to be mere moonshine, may, for aught that I know to the contrary, be something very explanatory, decent, and much to the purpose: but to us, who are not yet favoured with this inspiration, it seems wretched jargon, to evade an important question, and to scatter falsehood and slavery in the place of truth and freedom. Again: When, seeing IGNORANCE in the people to be the true cause of the success of political impostors, and the foundation of all tyranny, we endeavour to dissolve the potent charm by the light of reason; and, in order to erect the science of civil government, as every other science is erected, on a *knowledge of principles*, and by offering definitions which every well constituted mind must admit, Mr. *Young*, sensible of the danger to the cause he has espoused from this mode of proceeding, attempts to make all *principle*, all *reformers*, and all *reforming on principle* the objects of his ridicule and gross abuse; and perpetually takes care to parry every well-pointed truth, with the artful battle of evasion.

Thus, in order to shun any definition of political liberty, which might add a truth to the science of civil government, he says, " But nothing can be more futile, than presuming to lay down the principles of any complex constitution.

h,

" Principles

“ Principles may be deduced from extremes, but
 “ not so easily from intermediate compounds. The
 “ principle of a despotism may be said to be *slavery* ;
 “ the principle of a democracy may be called *anar-*
 “ *chy* ; but what is the principle of various aristo-
 “ cracies, mixed republics, and limited monar-
 “ chies ?” (p. 76.) And does Mr. *Young* imagine
 that, with this one breath of his nonsense, he has
 blown away all the principles of the *English Constitution* ? Here we are expected to understand that the
principle and the *effect* of an institution, are one and
 the same. Then look but three pages forward, and
 he tells you, that *principle* and *cause* are one and the
 same.* And is it by such puerile gibberish as this,
 that the good sense of *England* is to be insulted, in
 the base attempt to trample on our liberties. and
 to blot out all knowledge of “ the principles of our
 “ complex constitution !” Are we to be told that
 “ nothing can be more futile than presuming to lay
 “ down such principles” as the following ;—that
 protection and allegiance are reciprocal duties ? that
 taxation in particular, and the obligatory force of
 law in general, depend on Representation, from
 which they were inseparable ?—that Trial by Jury ;

* “ What are Doctor *Johnson*’s definitions of the word prin-
 “ ciple ?

“ 1. Element. 2. Original Cause. 3. Operative Cause. 4.
 “ Fundamental Truth. 5. Ground of Action.” (p. 79.)

promptness

promptness and purity in the administration of justice; the separation of the legislative, executive and judicative functions, are all sacred fundamentals of our government?—that the person of an Englishman who offends not against the law, cannot be touched by the power of the king; and that his humble straw-covered cottage is his impregnable castle, equally secure from such an intruder?—that to have arms of defence, the liberty of speech, the liberty of the press, the liberty of conscience in matters of religion, as well as the liberty of petitioning at pleasure any or all the branches of the legislature for redress of grievances, are amongst the *principles* of the “complex constitution” of England?

Mr. Young, proceeds;—“Suppose a government (without entering into details) to be good, the principle of it is *liberty*: but there is *Swiss* liberty, *Dutch* liberty, *American* liberty, *English* liberty: attempt the analysis, and draw the principle of each, and what is the result, but the confusion of vain theories, as numerous and contradictory as the heads that dream them.” (p. 77.)

From hence I suppose we are to infer, that political liberty is like complexion, or language, or the cut of a coat; on one side of a river, or a sea,

or a mountain, it is one thing; on the other side, it is another. And hence also I presume we are expected to draw this instructive and comfortable inference;—that although geometry, physics, optics, ethics, notwithstanding they are products of different nations, are in all nations the same; and stand respectively on simple principles and clear definitions as their several foundations; yet that that branch of knowledge which the *Alfreds*, the *Hampdens*, the *Harringtons*, the *Miltons*, the *Sidneys* and the *Lockes* have esteemed the master science;—the science of civil government—that grand object of human learning, on which human happiness next to religion most depends; is no science at all; nor is deducible from any immutable principles whatever; and that political liberty is a non-entity, a “dream” produced by “the confusion of vain theories.”

But to return to our proper topic. The reader must keep in mind that *personal representation* is the immediate and essential *cause*, of which political liberty is the *effect*; and that, in a community too large for *personal legislation*, if that cause be wanting, political liberty cannot have an existence. As *time*, according to the happy expression of Dr. *Franklin*, is the stuff that life is made of; so may *personal representation*, with equal propriety, be called, the stuff of which political liberty is made. But, independent of metaphor, that it is its immediate

diate cause having been demonstrated, it necessarily follows, that the outrageous war waged by Mr. *Young*, nominally against *personal representation*, is in truth and fact waged against POLITICAL LIBERTY: and the extent of his new enmity against it—for where so much rancour as in the bosom of an apostate?—may be collected from the multitude of his attacks, and from the indecent virulence of the language in which he expresses his hatred, whenever he speaks of personal representation. Whereas, had Mr. *Young*, after assigning their due weight to all the causes of *anarchy* at *Paris* in the winter of the year 1792, which I have enumerated, contented himself with remarking that even liberty itself, given without stint to men unpractised in political acts and the orderly proceedings of free governments, and effervescing in minds uninstructed in her peaceful lore, might in some degree be said to have contributed towards an agitation and confusion so much to be lamented; he would have spoken a language, the temper and impartiality of which must have gained him the esteem, if not the acquiescence, of all good men.

So then, having penetrated this general charge against the people of *France*, a charge fabricated for the two-fold purpose of justifying the war, and of making war on the Reformers of *England*; an obscure charge artfully exhibited through the

medium of a dense, magnifying mist of words, either not understood or grossly perverted; and seeing that that which Mr. *Young* is so anxious the *Example of France* should warn Britain to *shun*;—is neither more or less than POLITICAL LIBERTY; we can no longer be at a loss to account for his objections to *Reform*, and his enmity to *Reformers*.

If it be the real sentiment of a man's mind, that rulers ought not to allow the people political liberty; but ought merely to govern and protect; let him not come forth in a mask—let him not be ashamed to express what he really thinks; but speak out, and argue the point fairly. I know of no moral blame in a man's expressing such an opinion, if it be his opinion:—nay, if he will prove it to the satisfaction of my mind, I will be his convert. But when a man is seen attempting to carry such a point by all the arts of foul play, the natural inference is, that he is actually cheating his own conscience, while vainly attempting to impose on other men's understandings.

And until another definition than that which I have given of political liberty can be devised, it would be well if some even of our *Reformers* would duly consider the ground they stand on, when they propose *any* abridgement whatever of political liberty, or, in other words, of representation. I will not, however,

however, deny that, in some countries, and in some conditions of society, there may be enslaved classes of men in such ignorance and depravity, and so very numerous in comparison of the other inhabitants, that it might be useless to the enslaved themselves, and destruction to the rest, suddenly to proclaim complete, unqualified freedom to all. In the *West Indies*, for instance, to open a door to a progressive emancipation of the Negroes, which within a reasonable and safe compass of time should completely enfranchise the whole race, and train them to the habits and duties of citizens, would in my judgment be more consonant to wisdom, goodness, and a sincere love of liberty; than suddenly, and without any proper measures for preparing them for so great a change, to proclaim at once the emancipation of all. And if in this island, *the very soil of which is declared by our law, to give freedom to the slave who once sets foot upon it*, there are persons who in sincerity believe, that all who are not householders are either so ignorant and depraved, or otherwise so dangerous to the rest, as to be unfit for political liberty, I certainly cannot censure them for holding such a sentiment, or for offering arguments in its support; although, being a question which involves the political liberty of a majority of the nation, it certainly becomes them to treat the subject in the language of sobriety, diffidence and respect; and those who treat it

otherwise only afford reason to suspect a conscious want of argument; or that, like Messrs. *Pitt*, *Dundas*, *Jennings* and *Young*, they have some sinister plan, of which in due time they mean to avail themselves.

What has already been said will make it unnecessary to go largely into Mr. *Young*'s intemperate attack upon Reform and Reformers; but it must not be altogether overlooked; for we are not to consider it as the envenomed effusions of a mere individual, in which light it would be too contemptible for notice; but as a key to the designs of persons in power. In that view, the enquiry will be important; and will prove those designs to be of the most hostile nature to the liberties of this country. Knowing that the author is in the pay and patronage of ministers, and seeing how exactly correspondent his *present* writings are with their conduct, in reviewing the former we are of course investigating the latter. It may be well for those ministers, if that conduct should never undergo an investigation of a more serious nature.

Now, in order to judge of the propriety of the attack made by Mr. *Young* on *Reform* and *Reformers*, the nature of the reform demanded is first to be considered. To do this, we must state the evil to be reformed; the grievance of which we complain.

plain. Our grievance, then, is, that the BRITISH CONSTITUTION, notwithstanding we see the *forms* of it remaining, is—not merely endangered;—not only violated;—not simply incroached upon; but, —*if there be truth in a Petition, which on the 6th of May, 1793, was entered on the Journals of the House of Commons, no man denying any of its allegations—* then that Constitution must in effect be OVERTHROWN: and our demand is, that it may be restored, by means of a REFORM. And if the overthrow of a constitution constitutes a revolution, then those who feel a horror at the idea of a revolution, will do well to consider, if there be not more modes than those of arms and open force, by which a revolution may be brought about and accomplished.

On those Journals, by means of that Petition, it stands recorded, that *a decided majority* of that House is regularly seated there by the direct authority, and undue, but irresistible influence of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR MEN.—If this be not in effect an overthrow of the Constitution, we have lost our language, as well as our liberties.—What more had *Augustus* to do, after he had got the Roman senate at his devotion! If, seeing that once-awful body, which ought to represent the MILLIONS of Britain, thus ridden by a faction of ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR, with a man at their head who has dared to maintain in the face of this once-free country, that *the crown has a right*

to land foreign mercenary armies in this island at its discretion, and unlimited as to number; if seeing, I say, these things, we can imagine that the shadow of a constitution is intended long to remain to us, we must be more deficient in intellect than the Hottentots; and if we tamely submit to these mongrel sovereigns the Borough-mongers, we must be baser than the basest of human kind. What is it but legislative representation that can place the people of England above the human cattle of Muscovy, where they are sold with the estates on which they were bred; and sometimes given in whole herds as presents to a general, for making havoc of the human species, in the accursed cause of despotism!

Let us now see to what lengths of daring, under the patronage of this audacious faction, Mr. Young's licentious pen has ventured. "What," says he, "was the OBJECT of the war? Let this point be ascertained clearly in every rational mind, for it is the polar star that can alone guide through the confusion of arguments with which Jacobin oratory entangles the question for the deception of the people. THAT OBJECT was the preservation of the BRITISH CONSTITUTION against the attacks avowed and concealed—open or insidious—by cannon in *Flanders* or by Jacobin clubs in *England*, of French principles." (p. 207.)

That

That these which Mr. *Young* calls *French principles*, reduced to their quintessence, are *personal representation*, or in other words, *political liberty*, has already appeared. And does he not expressly say,—“ It is not *Robespierre* and *Egalité* that have “ murdered *Louis*, it was *Necker* with his *double tiers*; it is *personal representation*!” Now what is it which the author calls the BRITISH CONSTITUTION? “ There are men,” says he, “ pretending “ to be moderate, who argue for, and are ready “ to declare their approbation of the English Constitution, as fixed in King, Lords, and Commons, considering the Commons as the representatives of the people; and they contend that “ as the Commons do purport to be a representation of the people, they wish for no other *alteration* in the government, than to make that “ House really that which it purports to be. This “ is the most rational ground that any reformer “ can take, because here is a semblance of propriety. Very few words will be necessary to “ shew from facts that it is only a semblance. I “ contend, in reply, that it is mere theory to suppose that the House of Commons purports to “ be the representatives of the people, if by representation is meant *choice*. Being once chosen “ by the few, they represent the many. They “ purport to be nothing more than what they are “ and they are nothing more than this—men sitting “ in a senate, and forming a third branch of the “ legislature,

“ legislature, chosen by certain bodies, who, BY
 “ THE CONSTITUTION, have the privilege of elect-
 “ ing them.” (p. 89.) The prosperity and hap-
 “ piness we have enjoyed for a century, and never
 “ so great as at present, is owing precisely to the
 “ House of Commons NOT speaking the will of
 “ the people.” (p. 94.) “ What was the *origi-*
 “ *nal cause* of the House of Commons? The
 “ Crown. What was *the operative cause* of the
 “ House of Commons? The Crown. What
 “ was the *fundamental truth* on which the House
 “ of Commons was founded? That the Crown
 “ *had the power* to found it. What was *the ground*
 “ *of action* in founding the House of Commons?
 “ A commission from the Crown.” (p. 79.)
 “ The House of Commons was NOT CREATED by
 “ the people, but BY THE CROWN; never did
 “ represent the people in any period of our his-
 “ tory; *and is not responsible to the people.*”
 (p. 200.) “ An unequal representation, rotten
 “ boroughs, long parliaments, extravagant courts,
 “ selfish ministers, and corrupt majorities, are so
 “ intimately interwoven with our practical free-
 “ dom, that it would require better political ana-
 “ tomists than our modern reformers, to shew, in
 “ fact, that we did not owe our liberty * to the

* If Mr. Young's ideas of liberty be in truth so confused, as this and other passages indicate, he may be much excused for his present political extravagances.

“ identical

“ identical evils which they want to expunge.”
(p. 171.)

Here then we have, it seems, *that* Constitution, for the preservation of which, the present war, so expensive, so bloody, so disastrous, and so big with awful consequences was undertaken;—*that* constitution, which has given *the* sovereignty to the proprietors and patrons of our rotten boroughs; *that* constitution which Mr. Reeves and his Crown and Anchor Associates are so anxious to defend; *—*that* Constitution which is so pleasing to ministers and their majorities;—and that Constitution which, if not soon reformed, WILL BE THE GRAVE OF ENGLISH FREEDOM.

It is to be hoped that *such* a constitution was not in the contemplation of Lord Chief Justice *Eyre*, when he noticed in his charge to the Grand Jury of Middlesex, “ the *existing* laws and constitution.” In another part, indeed, he says, the “ design to “ overthrow the whole government of the country, “ to pull down and to subvert from its very foundations THE BRITISH MONARCHY.” Now, whether by the first expression, coupled with what we know of *facts*, we are to understand that our

* See Mr. Reeves’s letter to the author, inclosing a Resolution of Thanks “ for his excellent pamphlet, in which he has so successfully opposed the testimony of FACTS and experience, to “ the hazardous speculations of visionary theorists in matters of “ government.”

government is become an OLIGARCHY; or by the latter expression, and carried away by *appearances*, we are to consider it as a MONARCHY; comes much to the same thing, so long as those who have all the power of it are agreed in their measures. But, perhaps the OLIGARCHY, although in effect the real sovereigns, may as a matter of prudence adopt the word MONARCHY. It is, however, pretty bold, to tell Englishmen, and by the lips of one, from whom on so solemn an occasion the utmost legal precision and accuracy were due, that they live under a MONARCHY; as that word, having no other signification than *the government of ONE*, is perfectly synonymous with DESPOT. Now when we duly reflect on the *two years preparation* for the late trials; and ponder on the whole of that Drama, of which those trials, from the first framing of the plot of the piece, were intended to make a distinct, but not the last and most bloody act of the tragedy, we cannot but be struck by certain coincidences. Here we are told, on one word, that we live under a MONARCHY: while Mr. Young, and his kind assistants in our associations, have for two years past been circulating doctrines preparatory to this stab to the English Constitution.

Every one knows that the CROWN creates the House of Lords; and as Mr. Young makes it the creator of the House of Commons also; it is no great strain of language, *after this*, to call our government

vernment a MONARCHY. Nor could any thing better suit the purpose of the Borough-mongers, than to have it considered and administered as such; for then they must succeed in rendering "*the existing laws*" unalterable but by their sovereign will; and in establishing the doctrine which, by a series of the most extraordinary acts upon record in this country, from the first sounding of their Alarm Bell down to the trials of *Hardy, Taake* and *Thelwall*, they have so strenuously laboured to establish:—that *to design and attempt to give to the House of Commons, any other than ITS PRESENT CREATORS, would thenceforth be High Treason.*

"In England," says Mr. Young, "a portion of the members of the House of Commons is influenced by the Crown and by the Lords; another portion elect themselves; and the remainder, though elected by the People, yet consider themselves as not bound by instructions, and pursue that conduct generally, which to themselves alone seems good: all this influence is poison in the eyes of *reformers*—but to men who are governed entirely by facts, and who consequently despise theory, this influence appears to be coeval with our *freedom*, if not the *sole cause* of it.*

"Fact

* That the selfish contentions between arbitrary kings and tyrant barons, and other acts no way honourable to the actors, by causing *legislative representation* caused *political liberty*, is certainly true;

"Fact, therefore justifies it; and the counter *experiment of France* has proved, that REPRESENTATION UNINFLUENCED GENERATES TYRANNY."

(p. 82.) How convenient, and how candid, thus to decide so important a question, by reference to an experiment *not at this moment concluded*, although this decision has been more than two years dogmatically pronounced; while the example and experience of *America* is here again to be over-

true; but to say that political liberty can be *caused* by that which *destroys* legislative representation, is as absurd as to say, that the sense of sight can be caused by putting out a man's eyes. In this country, where it has been known and felt that legislative representation is the fundamental principle of the government; and where that principle at some periods has had even a considerable, although an imperfect existence; it must not only by its own impetus, but by the very *awe* with which it has inspired the votaries of arbitrary power, have considerably operated *towards* the same ends as a more complete political liberty would have done. Had Mr. *Young* maintained that such *persuasions* in the minds of the people, and such an *awe* on the minds of legislators and rulers, together with that *proportion of real political liberty*, which has, more or less, at different times existed in England; have jointly and collectively caused in this country a degree of prosperity unknown to nations which did not possess *like advantages*, he would have spoken correctly; but be the *prosperity*—that is the wealth, the civilization, the arts and luxuries—of any nation what it may; that *prosperity* is still as distinct from *political liberty*; as the finery, the jewels, the gold, and the luxurious enjoyments of an African *Yarico*, are distinct from her power of holding all these things independent of the *Ink'e* that may strip her and sell her to-morrow. He that knows not these distinctions, is unfit for a political instructor; he that, knowing, purposely confounds them, for the ends of delusion, is an enemy to his country.

looked!

looked! If the French have active imaginations and a proneness to theory, to mislead their judgment, the Americans are as phlegmatic and matter-of-fact a people as any on earth; yet they, *justified by fact*, and *warned by experience*, an experience which drenched their country in blood, and threatened it with unconditional submission, determined to have neither bishops, nor lords, nor a king, to influence their representatives. They saw no necessity for having influence coëval with their freedom; much less could their sober, sound understandings conceive how *freedom* could be the effect of *such a cause*. In short, not having capacities for a *theory* so sublime and mysterious, they contented themselves with the observation of *fact*, and the "*Common Sense*" of Paine.

No evidence has yet been produced to shew that they have considered themselves as mistaken, or even suspected themselves to be in an error; and have not they, as well as we, *The Example of France* before their eyes? When that example shall prevail with them to cast away their *uninfluenced representation*, it will go a great way towards reconciling me to rotten-boroughs. The *ipse dixit* of Mr. Young, who tells us, that "if there be one principle more predominant than another in his politics, it is "*the principle of change*," does not, in my mind, go quite so far. Now, although in the passage on *influence* just quoted, and in many others through-

out the work under consideration, there is an appearance of the most profound ignorance of the *nature* and *cause* of political liberty; yet the author, before *the principle of change* produced his pamphlet, had discovered some notions approaching to more knowledge and accuracy on the subject. Reporting a conversation in *France* in which he bore a part, he says, " My argument was an appeal to the English constitution; take it at once, which is the business of a single vote; *by your possession of a real and equal representation of the people*, you have freed it from ITS ONLY GREAT OBJECTION."*

But those who were not so quick at changing as the changeable Mr. *Young*, and who in the winter of 1792, continued to think as Mr. *Young* had thought in the summer of the same year, this candid gentleman thought fit to brand with the foulest names and imputations; and to charge them with a design to abolish the lords, to dismiss the king, and to introduce a system of general plunder, massacre and anarchy. They were to be described as " sects of associations, for spreading discontent—offsets of sedition;" (p. 84.) " Jacobin advocates for *improving* our representation;" (p. 100.) " friends of reform, more subtle and more dangerous than banditti, cut-throats and Jacobins;"

* *Travels*, p. 127.

(p. 179.) “ and the vultures and harpies of reform, (p. 226.) When a writer is bold enough to speak of *personal representation*, without which *political liberty* has no existence, as that “ which, in one “ word, fums up all that is atrocious in political “ depravity,” (p. 105.) it is passing the *Rubicon* against the liberties of his country; and from that moment its friends have nothing to expect but his reproaches and his hostility.

It is only because Mr. *Young* has taught us Reformers, that *nonsense is not apt to be without a meaning*, that he is complimented with a reply. In doing this on my own behalf, I am naturally led to see how far that gentleman and myself had jogged on together in the cause of reform; and which of us had found most fault with the British Constitution. In the single article of painting the abuses and corruptions in the representative part of the constitution, perhaps upon the whole I have gone farther than my companion; but I do not recollect to have *wilified the constitution itself*. I have said, and still say, that if the rotten-borough system be not utterly annihilated, it will annihilate our liberties; but I never pronounced the British Constitution *worthless*. I have long and strenuously contended for *reforming and preserving* the constitution; which I conceive not to come within the idea of *changing*. How far Mr. *Young*'s condemnation of the abuses in

our government have gone, and how far he has figured as a reformer, remains now to be seen.

“Certainly,” says he, “the *height* to which
 “taxation of every kind is carried in England, is
 “cruel, shameful, and tyrannical.”*—“The abuses
 “that are rooted in all the old governments of
 “*Europe*, give such numbers of men such a direct
 “interest in supporting, cherishing and defending
 “abuses, *that no wonder advocates for tyranny of*
 “*every species, are found in every country*, and almost
 “in every company. What a mass of people in
 “every part of England, are some way or other
 “interested in the present representation of the peo-
 “ple, tythes, charters, corporations, monopolies,
 “and taxation! and not merely to the things them-
 “selves, but *to all the abuses attending them*; and
 “how many are there who derive their profit or
 “their consideration in life, not merely from such
 “institutions, but from the evils they engender!
 “*The great mass of the people, however, is free from*
 “*such influence, and will be enlightened by degrees*:
 “assuredly they will find out in every country of
 “Europe, that *by combinations*, on the principles of
 “liberty and property, aimed equally against regal,
 “aristocratical and mobbish tyranny; they will be
 “able *to resist successfully* THAT VARIETY OF COM-
 “BINATION WHICH, ON PRINCIPLES OF PLUN-

* *Travels*, p. 523.

INTRODUCTION.

cxxxiii

“DER AND DESPOTISM, IS EVERY WHERE AT
“WORK TO ENSLAVE THEM.”*

Speaking of the necessity of “some intermediate and independent body between the people and the executive power in *France*,” he says, “every one must grant, that if there be no such body, the people are enabled, when they please, to annihilate the executive authority.”†—

After reasoning a little, he adds, “That these circumstances may prove advantageous in an aristocratical portion of a legislature, there is reason to believe; the inquiry is, whether they be counterbalanced by possible, or probable evils. May there not come within this description, the danger of *an aristocracy uniting with the crown against the people?* that is to say, influencing by weight of property and power, a great mass of the people dependent—against the rest of the people independent? Do we not see this to be very much the case in England at this moment? *To what other part of our constitution is it imputable that* WE HAVE BEEN IN—

* *Travels*, p. 540.—See also p. xix, and xx, of this Introduction, where I am severely reprimanded for saying, “Their demand is their rights. They want no patrons; and their friends will be their servants. Their operations are infallible, their strength will soon be invincible.”

Ibid. p. 547.

“ FAMOUSLY INVOLVED IN PERPETUAL WARS,*
 “ *from which none reap any benefit, but that tribe*
 “ *of vermin which thrive most, when a nation*
 “ *most declines*; contractors, victuallers, paymasters,
 “ stock-jobbers, and money-scriveners; a set by
 “ whom ministers are surrounded; and in favour
 “ of whom whole classes amongst the people are
 “ beggared and ruined†. Those who will assert
 “ *a constitution can be good which suffers these*
 things,

* When the objects, the instigators and supporters of the present war are duly considered, it will assist us in appreciating the merits of *The Example of France a Warning to Britain*: and to account for such a production coming from the same pen, as furnished the matter now quoted, I must refer the reader to p. 180 of that work. “ Speculative arrangements of state offices,” says the writer, “ are sometimes amusing—let us suppose one of these orators a SECRETARY, &c.” what in such a case, would at once become of all this ruin? Where, alas! would be found the rights of the press, the rights of the people, the rights of representation, the rights of no excise? A magic wand is waved over the island, and evils fly off like the evaporation of an ætherial mist—the atmosphere clears—the sun shines. This is no supposition or theory; it is FACT, deduced from a thousand EXPERIMENTS.—It is *history, experience and man.*”

† As a remedy for the evil here complained of, and an improvement on the mode of infusing into a constitution the benefits of an “ intermediate and independent body, between the people and the executive power,” the American Aristocracy, instead of owing its creation *immediately* to the executive magistrate, derives it *mediately* from the people. The creation of the English Aristocracy has not in all periods stood as it now stands;

INTRODUCTION.

CXXXV

“ things, ought at least to agree, that such a one as
“ would not suffer them would be much better.*

At the word *good* Mr. *Young* has this *note*. “ It
“ ought not to be allowed *even tolerable*, for this
“ plain reason, such public extravagance engenders
“ taxes to an amount, that will sooner or later
“ *force the people into resistance*, which is always
“ the destruction of a constitution; and surely
“ that must be admitted *bad*, which carries to the
“ most careless eye the seeds of its own destruc-
“ tion. *Two hundred and forty millions* of public
“ debt in a century, is in a ratio impossible to be
“ supported; and therefore evidently ruinous.”†

At the word *better*, he has also this *note*. ‘ The
‘ direct power of the king of *England*, says Mr.
‘ *Burke*, is considerable. His *indirect* is great in-
‘ deed. When was it that a king of *England*
‘ wanted wherewithal to make him respected,
‘ courted, or perhaps even feared in every state
‘ in *Europe*?’ “ Who questions, or can question,
“ the power of a prince, that in less than a cen-
“ tury has expended above ONE THOUSAND MIL-
“ LIONS, and involved his people in a debt of above
“ TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY! The point in de-
stands; and it may, in some future day, become a question,
whether its preservation may not depend on some improvement
in its modification.

* *Travels*, p. 547 † *Ibid.* p. 547.

“ bate is not the *existence* of power, but its *excess*.
 “ WHAT IS THE CONSTITUTION THAT GENERATES
 “ OR ALLOWS OF SUCH EXPENCES? The very
 “ mischief complained of is here wrought into a
 “ merit, and brought in argument to prove that
 “ poison is salutary.”

Again: “ What can we know, experimentally,
 “ of a government, which has not stood the brunt
 “ of unsuccessful and of successful wars? The
 “ English constitution has stood this test, and has
 “ been found *deficient*; or rather, as far as this test
 “ can decide any thing, *has been proved* WORTH-
 “ LESS; since, in a single century, it has in-
 “ volved the nation in a debt of so vast a magni-
 “ tude, that every blessing which might otherwise
 “ have been perpetuated is put to the stake; so
 “ that if the nation do not make some *change in*
 “ *its constitution*, it is much to be dreaded that
 “ THE CONSTITUTION WILL RUIN THE NATION.”
 “ Nor was it without reason said by a popular
 “ writer, that a government formed like the En-
 “ glish, obtains more revenue than it could do,
 “ either by *direct despotism*, or in a *full state of*
 “ *freedom*.*

“ The means of making a government respected
 “ and beloved are, in *England*, obvious; taxes

* *Travels*, p. 548.

“ must

“ must be immensely reduced; assessments on
 “ malt, leather, candles, soap, salt, and windows,
 “ must be abolished or lightened; the funding
 “ system, the parent of taxation, annihilated for
 “ ever, by taxing the interest of the public debt—
 “ the constitution that admits a debt, carries in its
 “ vitals the seeds of its destruction; tythes and
 “ tithes abolished; THE REPRESENTATION OF PAR-
 “ LIAMENT REFORMED, AND ITS DURATION SHORT-
 “ ENED; not to give the people, without pro-
 “ perty, a predominancy, but to prevent that
 “ corruption, IN WHICH OUR DEBTS AND TAXES
 “ HAVE ORIGINATED; the utter destruction of all
 “ monopolies, and among them, of all charters
 “ and corporations; game made property, and
 “ belonging to the possessor of one acre, as much
 “ as to him who has a thousand; and lastly, the
 “ laws, both criminal and civil, to be thoroughly
 “ reformed.—These circumstances include the
 “ great evils of the British Constitution; if they
 “ be remedied, it may enjoy even a Venetian lon-
 “ gevity, *but if they be allowed, like cancerous bu-*
 “ *mours, to prey on the nobler parts of the political*
 “ *system, this boasted fabric may not exist even*
 “ *twenty years.*”*

After the arguments in these several quotations shall be duly considered, the candid reader will

* *Travels*, p. 550.

determine,

determine, whether the persevering Reformer, or he who has apostatised from his principles, and become the unblushing advocate of every thing that is base and immoral in government, has most need of an apology. The present prince of apostates is become, as we have seen, perfectly enamoured with the rotten-borough filth of *England*, and the champion for a complete restoration of the old government of *France* with terrors in its train. So congenial, indeed, is his mind become with any thing and every thing destructive of freedom, that rather than not see it trampled under foot, he will put up with even the dregs of despotism. If the antient monarchy cannot be restored in *France*, he can even take consolation in the success of an usurper, as base, as cruel, as bloody and detestable, as ever excited the abhorrence and detestation of mankind. "Thus," says he, "may the welfare of *Europe* much depend on the personal interests of such a chief as *Robespierre*, who cannot establish his own power without destroying in a great measure the establishment of such a system as the Convention, if it supports itself *free*, may probably effect; a despotic usurper in *France* may find his interest in a peace, and the governments of his neighbours have no reason to be alarmed at a power which will not necessarily be adverse to the principles of their own."* Gra-

* Annals of Agriculture, No. 129, p. 296.

cious heaven! Is it possible that a Christian can thus forget his humanity? That he can wish his enemy to be unworthy his friendship, unworthy of freedom, unworthy of happiness!—That he should not prefer a thousand deaths to the slavery of twenty-five millions of his fellow-men!—And the man of letters, whose pen has made our bosoms thrill with horror at the old despotism of *France*,—can he wish that despotism to return?—can he pray for its re-establishment with new terrors in its train?—can he take consolation in the hope of seeing a fiend raised by murders innumerable to the throne of the Bourbons?—a throne which in that case must have stood insulated from all approach to the suspicious tyrant, by a surrounding sea of blood? If such, O Apostacy, be the sacrifices thou demandest, how tyrannic thy dreadful dominion! how diabolic thy worship! Rather than be thy votary, may annihilation extinguish this spark of life!—Like the beast that perisheth, may I die and be no more!

These reflections lead me to the consideration of some singular passages in Mr. *Young's* pamphlet, on the subject of atheism. Having met with a writer who leaves far behind him all Reformers, and stops not short of a complete *regeneration* of society, on a system of his own; and who at the same time cannot, like the untutored Indian, “ See

God in clouds, nor hear him in the wind;" nor indeed discover him either in the beauty, the wisdom, or the wonders of his works; neither in revelation, nor in reason; nor in matter, nor in mind;—Mr. *Young*, I say, having met with such a writer, immediately proves, by aid of an admirable art, which we may call his *Revolutionary Logic*, that all political reformation *on principle*, naturally and necessarily terminates in atheism!!! After quoting passages from Mr. *Godwin*, descanting on the propriety of abolishing royalty and aristocracy; on the tyranny of all coercion by penal laws; on the benefits of anarchy; on the injury to human virtue to have teachers of religion; and offering arguments against the being of a God;* "*such*," says Mr. *Young*, "*is the natural and inevitable progress of a spirit of reform, aided by the liberty of the press !!!*" (p. 219)

He proceeds with his quotations and allusions, about personal representation; about giving vigour to the basest depravity; sanctioning murder; prohibiting punishment; levelling property; abolishing marriage; the sexes having an unrestrained intercourse, and no parent knowing his own child; with some nonsense about its being within human choice, whether to live or to die; and then

* I refer only to Mr. *Young*'s quotations, for I have not seen the original work,

gravely observes, that Mr. Godwin “ *is the very good friend of our Reformers; who, though they do not profess to go quite so far, adopt principles that, by analogy, carry them equal lengths !!!*” (p.223) And after other passages about the perfection of being without all law and all government; conscience the only tribunal; gratitude no part of virtue; subjection to a king undermining the altar of virtue; a national assembly rendering mankind timid, dissembling, and corrupt; national councils pernicious; and the unreasonableness and injustice of deciding on truth by casting up numbers; he again gravely asks,—“ *Do not all these extravagances prove the real nature of reform?*” (p.224)—And do not such admirable arguments and such wondrous inferences prove, the real nature and political utility of Mr. Young’s new-invented *Revolutionary Logic*?—a logic by which, without the aid of truth, or the expence of thought, a politician from any premises may prove any thing, as fast as his pen can run?—While thinking myself a harmless Englishman, anxiously wishing for a parliamentary reform, and to see my country governed on the principles of justice, wisdom and virtue; to my no small surprise, I first find myself proved by this magical kind of logic, to be a Jacobin, a Leveller, an Anarchist, and a Murderer: and then, while fancying myself a Christian, and believing it to be folly and wickedness, even to blasphemy, to pretend

tend that fraud, imposture and corruption, are necessary in national government; or that *England* can neither be free nor prosperous, unless *France* be enslaved and ruined; I perceive again, with equal amazement, that I am demonstrably either already an atheist, or by “*the natural and inevitable progress of a spirit of reform,*” must soon become one!—To this happy invention of the *Revolutionary Logic*, there is nothing wanting but the spirit of *poetry*, to make our author a second *Ovid*. If this be “*the natural and inevitable progress*” of his art, as “*by analogy*” and “*the real nature*” of that art seems to be the case, I have only one favour to ask at his hands. When he shall exercise upon me his metamorphosing talent, let me not be changed into an Apostate!

As to *Atheism* itself, it is, as I should conceive, a mere disease of the mind, a particular species of insanity; to which politicians of different classes may be equally subject. But according to my apprehensions, if I could once be brought to believe in the *necessity*, in the *utility*, or in the *expediency* of a regular system of *fraud, corruption, “plunder and despotism,”* in national government; from that moment I must *cease to believe* in the being of a *God*, or the existence of a *moral law*; for how a *moral law* and such systems can be reconciled, I have not yet learnt; or how a *moral law* can be rationally

ally derived from any of the *atheistical* theories that I have yet heard of, is utterly incomprehensible to my understanding. And it will add to my small stock of knowledge, to be informed how Mr. *Young* reconciles with the being of a *God*, and the existence of a *moral law*, his present extreme hostility to the reform of a *fraudulent* and *corrupt* system, “*which, on principles of plunder and despotism, is at work to enslave*” the people;*—and his strenuous exertions to rivet on the necks of thirty millions of his fellow creatuers, “*a despotism much heavier than ever France experienced.*”*

Now, in order to shew the inventor of the *Revolutionary Logic*, the excellence of his new science, he himself shall be proved an atheist in an instant.—Mr. *Godwin*, according to Mr. *Young* declares himself an atheist. Mr. *Godwin* “*is the very good friend of the Reformers,*” but carries the doctrines of reform to “*extravagance*”: Therefore all the Reformers are Atheists.—But there is a periodical writer, who is an *anti-reformer*: This writer is an atheist: This atheist maintains that “*The government of a populous, commercial, and progressive nation, can be formed only by the assumptive power of property and not the equal representation of number in the great mass of the people*”: Therefore Mr. *Young*, who is an anti-reformer, maintaining the same doctrine, is an *atheist*. Can any conclusion be

* See p. cxxxi—cvii.

more logically deduced? And can there after this be any premises, from which any conclusion may not be drawn as fast as the pen can run?—The writer to whom I have alluded, tells us that, “Co-
 “ equality being one of the essential qualities of
 “ matter, *every atom* must pass alternately, through
 “ all the existent modifications and energies of
 “ nature, from the highest to the lowest, and it
 “ becomes *the interest of matter*, when possessing
 “ higher energies or modes, to prepare happiness
 “ to all subordinate modes, e. g. the *atom* organized
 “ in the highest *intellectuality*, should contrive
 “ systems of happiness for all ignorant men, and
 “ also for the whole sensitive *creation*,* because
 “ these subordinate modes are all stages of its own
 “ *eternal* journey through indestructible existence,
 “ in which reminiscence [or apparent sameness,
 “ called identity] serves only as a vehicle or direc-
 “ tory post on the road to *good*, but cannot affect
 “ the real existence of the travelling atom to an
 “ eternal goal.”† With these sentiments, it is one
 of the unaccountable fancies of this gentleman, in
 his support of *things as they are*, to praise the *Church*
of England. “This rational religion,” says he,
 “is in appearance the basis of the fabric of moral
 “ mechanism, its temperate and philosophic ad-
 “ ministration, serves to concentrate the diversities
 “ of vulgar opinion, and to be the guardian of infant

* What; a *creation* without a *Creator*?

† Good Sense No. II. p. 2.

“ reason

“ reason, in its progress to adult manhood in the
 “ knowledge of self and its unity with nature.
 “ Should superstition rot it, or the indifference of
 “ scepticism ever bring it to decay, it will fall, I
 “ hope, like useless plaister ornaments from the
 “ masonry of thought, good sense, and moral prin-
 “ ciple, the triangular and real basis of the British
 “ Constitution.”—“ I could wish to pass over reli-
 “ gious credulity and zeal in profound silence,
 “ but I conscientiously believe them to be the only
 “ formidable enemies to the British Constitution;
 “ and as such I must guard against their treachery.”*
 So much, then, for atheism and atheists; whose
 creed being as difficult to digest as that of Athana-
 sius, will never give me alarm until atheism becomes
 established by Act of Parliament, with an inquisition
 for its support, and Mr. *Young* the Prime Minister;
 for he remarks, that “ The tolerating spirit of the
 “ old government of France, was one of the chief
 “ engines of its destruction;”—and says he, “ Were
 “ I a Spanish minister, I might advise my master
 “ to regulate the inquisition; but I would not ad-
 “ vise him to abolish it”—(p. 256.)

In respect of the propriety of the act itself, of
 reforming the House of Commons, it would be
 uncandid not to admit, that men may think it
 wrong; because on important subjects, men may
 be ignorant; and because it is one of those ques-

† Good Sense, No. II, p. 3.

tions, on which prejudice and self-interest must be supposed to operate with peculiar force ; but, as amongst those who are unprejudiced, and who wish to inquire before they decide, I conclude that to reform must be nearly an unanimous sentiment, I shall not in this place urge any new arguments ; enough having been already written to shew the necessity of that measure. On the subject of the *proper time* for the reform, if our infatuated rulers be yet within the possibility of instruction, and if the experience in *Belgium*, *Holland*, and *Spain* be not as much lost upon them, as were the plagues of *Egypt* upon *Pharaoh*, they will accede to the Reform while *Pichegru* is on the other side of the channel. Mr. *Young*, in this republication of 1794, has told us of *Dutch* liberty and *English* liberty*. A few months have shown him that what in *Holland* he called liberty was not worth fighting for : a few months more may convince him, whether or not the people of *England* will more highly value the liberty which he *now* thinks enough for *them*.

But so extremely awful and critical as the season is, I will not dismiss the present topic, without again consulting that gentleman. Deeply impressed, as it should seem, with a conviction how radically defective were all the governments of *Europe*, he says in his *Travels*, “ I may, however, recommend
“ such agricultural establishments; but they never

* See p. cxv.

“ were

INTRODUCTION. cxlvii

“ were made in *any* country, and never will be,
 “ till mankind are governed on principles abso-
 “ lutely contrary to those which prevail at pre-
 “ sent” (p. 54.)

“ All agree that the states of the kingdom can-
 “ not assemble without more liberty being the
 “ consequence; but I meet with so few men that
 “ have *any just ideas of freedom*, that I question
 “ much the *species** of this new liberty that is to
 “ arise. They know not how to value the privi-
 “ leges of THE PEOPLE.” (p. 66.)

“ I shall leave *Paris*, however, truly rejoiced,
 “ that the representatives of the people have it
 “ undoubtedly in their power so to improve the
 “ constitution of their country, as to render all
 “ great abuses in future, if not impossible, at least
 “ exceedingly difficult, and consequently will esta-
 “ blish to all useful purposes *an undoubted political*
 “ *liberty*†; and if they effect this, it cannot be
 “ doubted but that they will have a thousand op-
 “ portunities to secure to their fellow subjects
 “ the invaluable blessing of *civil liberty* also; the

* Instructed by the author’s *just ideas of freedom*, I suppose we must add a new *species* to those of which he has given us a catalogue, and call it *French liberty*.

† Notwithstanding such expressions as these, it is evident, from his note in page 549, that he neither understood the nature nor effects of true political liberty.

“ state of the finances is such, that the government
 “ may easily be kept virtually dependent on the
 “ states, and their periodical existence, absolutely
 “ secured. Such benefits will confer happiness
 “ on 25 millions of people ; a noble and animating
 “ idea, that ought to fill the mind of every citizen
 “ of the world, whatever be his country, religion,
 “ or pursuit.” (p. 125.)

“ Every thing being now decided, and the
 “ kingdom absolutely in the hands of the as-
 “ sembly, they have the power to make a new
 “ constitution, such as they think proper ; and it
 “ will be a great spectacle for the world to view
 “ in this enlightened age, the representatives of
 “ 25 millions of people, sitting on the construction
 “ of *a new and better order and fabric of liberty**
 “ than Europe has yet offered. It will now be
 “ seen

* Another instance to shew that the author possessed no accurate idea on the subject. Had he understood it, his ignorant insult on the memory of the *accurate* and venerable *Price*, (p. 8.) could not have disgraced his work ; nor indeed, as it seems to me, could the work itself ever have disgraced its author. Had, I say, he understood the subject of *political liberty*, his irritable, inflammable, wavering mind, must have been too well fortified against the temptations, either of vanity or interest, to have allowed him to become an instrument in the hands of a wicked faction, for the infernal purpose of extirpating political liberty, if possible, from the soil of *Europe* ; for, had his passions and prejudices hurried him into the attempt, *knowledge*, if he had had it, must soon have stopped him in his career, seeing the contradiction,

INTRODUCTION.

cxlix

“ seen, whether they will copy the constitution of
 “ *England*, freed from *its faults*, or attempt, from
 “ theory, to frame something absolutely specu-
 “ lative.” (p. 140.)

“ In regard to the future consequences of this
 “ singular revolution, as an example to other na-
 “ tions, there can be no doubt but the spirit which
 “ produced it will, sooner or later, spread through-
 “ out *Europe*, according to the different degrees
 “ of *illumination* amongst the common people ;
 “ and it will prove either mischievous or benefi-
 “ cial, in proportion to the previous steps taken
 “ by governments. It is unquestionably the sub-
 “ ject of all others, the most interesting to every
 “ class, and even to every individual of a modern
 “ state ; the great line of division, into which the
 “ people divides, is, first those that have property,
 “ and second those that have none. The events

tradition, absurdity, and immorality, into which he had been
 misled by *passion* and *prejudice*, governed ultimately by *knowledge*,
 he would have thrown the trash into the fire.

In his comment on *Price*, he says, “ No constitution or go-
 “ vernment could exist, while the people had the power to model
 “ it at pleasure ; for they never had such a power, *without bring-*
 “ *in its perpetual exercise* ; and a constitution perpetually changed,
 “ is not government, but anarchy.” (p. 81.)

Now all this is reasoning, and asserting in the teeth of noto-
 rious fact. See p. 51 and of this Introduction.

“ that have taken place in *France*, in many re-
 “ spects, have been subversive of property; and
 “ have been effected by the lower people, in
 “ direct opposition to the nominal legislature;
 “ yet this constitution began its establishment
 “ with a much greater degree of regularity, by a
 “ formal election of representatives, than there is
 “ any probability of seeing in other countries.
 “ Revolutions will there be blown up from riotous
 “ mobs—from the military called out to quell
 “ them, but refusing obedience, and joining the
 “ insurgents. Such a flame spreading rapidly
 “ through a country, must prove more hostile,
 “ and more fatal to property, than any thing that
 “ has prevailed in *France*. The probability of
 “ such events, every one must allow to be not in-
 “ considerable; the ruin that must attend them
 “ cannot be doubted; for they would tend to
 “ produce not a national assembly, and a free con-
 “ stitution, but an universal anarchy and confu-
 “ sion.” (p. 548.)

Here we find matter for some remarks. First, The
 spirit which produced the French Revolution will
necessarily spread through *Europe*. 2d, It must very
 early visit *England*; because, respecting “ the illu-
 “ mination of our common people” it probably
 exceeds that of any other European nation; for
 Mr.

INTRODUCTION.

cli

Mr. *Young* says, “ that universal circulation of
 “ intelligence, which in *England* transmits the least
 “ vibration of feeling or alarm, with electric sen-
 “ sibility, from one end of the kingdom to another,
 “ unites in bands of connection men of similar
 “ interests and situations,” (p. 147.) 3dly, If there
 could be *no doubt* of this spirit visiting *England*, and
 soon, why did not the writer advise the government
 to such “ *previous steps*, as should have rendered
 it beneficial,” instead of inflaming the people by
 falsehood and delusion, to join in the present most
 horrible war, *to prevent that which must come to pass*;
 and madly stimulating them to persevere in its con-
 tinuance, when nothing is to be expected from it
 but ruin or extreme distress? And 4thly, It seems
 that riotous mobs, and a mutinous army, actuated
 by the spirit which *produced* the French revolution,
 viz. the spirit of RESISTANCE TO OPPRESSION and
 REVENGE OF WRONGS, is sufficient, not only to
 bring about a revolution, but the destruction of
 property and order; although the people should
 be as ignorant of *personal representation*, as they are
 at this time in *Muscovy* and *Siberia*.

The author proceeds;—“ The first attempt to-
 “ wards a Democracy in England, would be the
 “ common people demanding an admission and
 “ voice in the vestries, and voting to themselves

“ whatever rates they thought proper to appropriate; which, in fact would be, an agrarian law.
 “ *Can there be so much supineness in the present governments of Europe, as to suppose, that old principles and maxims will avail any longer?*
 “ *Can such ignorance of the human heart, and such blindness to the natural course of events be found, as the plan of rejecting ALL innovations, lest they should lead to greater?*” (p. 549.)

Now I trust that in the following sheets it will be seen, that a fear of the poorer classes taking into their own hands to divide our property, at their discretion, can only arise from an ignorance of those complete securities, which our constitution, when honestly resorted to, afford us. In the astonishment here expressed by Mr. Young in 1792, at the conduct of the governments, which have reason to apprehend any thing from the operation of the principles he speaks of, I perfectly sympathise; for unless they court revolutions, and a concussion likely to dash in pieces and disperse all large properties, as well as to annihilate hereditary privileges, their conduct seems to border upon insanity. As to that change of sentiment in Mr. Young himself, which now induces him to declare, “ That the first lines of discontent, are in fact the most dangerous; that moderate reform, or any reform at all

“ ON

INTRODUCTION. ciii

“ ON PRINCIPLE, is a sure step to all that followed
 “ reform in *France* ; jacobinism, anarchy and
 “ blood *,” how can we expect the unhappy
 gentleman to talk more rationally, while we per-
 ceive his distempered mind, to be under the domi-
 nion of contradictions, and panic-struck with the
 terrifying idea, that a *reform* of political *injustice*
 and *corruption* leads, by “ natural and inevitable
 “ progress,” to ATHEISM ! *

If, however, a little nonsense were all we had to
 complain of, the consequences might not perhaps
 be worth attending to : but when we find the same
 writer with much eloquence * attacking all reform
 as dangerous, as criminal, and even as treasonable ;
 when we see Associations under the corrupt influ-
 ence of the tools of the Borough-mongers, applaud-
 ing such writings, and promoting their circulation,
 although containing doctrines utterly subversive of
 the constitution ; and when, finally, we behold the
 Borough-mongers themselves at the bottom of the
 conspiracy and its grand movers ; serious indeed
 are the grounds of alarm, to the friends of English
 liberty ! and mark the inconsistency and arrogant
 folly of the apostate enemy of Reform, intrusted
 with a leading part in this conspiracy. He is not
 content to strike at principle by sophistry, and at

* *Example of France a Warning to Britain.* p. 110.—219.

reform by misrepresentation ; but, as if the sense of our wrongs were not sufficiently keen, he must vilify, revile and insult every Reformer, with the foulest names, and the most daring accusations of guilt. He is not content with endeavouring to raise against them the iron arm of usurped power, but exerts his genius—a genius once in a virtuous alliance with liberty—to sting their bosoms with a sense of provocation and insult, under which they must be either more or less than men, not to rise in vindication of their characters and their cause. And while he thus labours to bring the country into such a state, that usurpation, corruption, and arbitrary power, shall be insurmountable by any peaceable means ; and to render a redress of public grievances utterly impracticable, through any of the legalized channels of the constitution ; he treats our statements of grievances with ridicule, our modes of seeking redress with contempt, and as deserving punishment ; and reminds us that, “ The fact is, “ that the *present* constitution of *England* was “ gradually extorted, sword in hand, from feudal “ sovereigns, deriving *their* rights from the sword “ of a conqueror ; nobly extorted, but derived from “ no other right.” (p. 85.)

Does this Secretary of a Public Board, of which all or most of the High Officers of State are members,

bers, mean to assure the Reformers, that redress will never be obtained, until it be extorted sword in hand ?

From the purport and tenor, however, of Mr. *Young's* book, holding towards the Reformers in general a language of the most extreme arrogance, contumely, and reviling; mixed with daring accusations of guilt, and with calls on government for punishment; as well as from the uniform conduct of his patrons, ever since the book's first appearance two years ago; it has been sufficiently apparent, that something might be expected from the hands of those patrons, but of a kind very different from a redress of grievances. Are the English people, then, so fallen, that for merely pretending to the rights and benefits of representation, their best friends are to be defiled with the flaver of reviling apostates ! Is it not enough, that justice to the nation, for many a tedious and calamitous year, should be delayed and denied ; but must Englishmen now, instead of the blessing of social and manly intercourse, have the curse of spies and betrayers, and false accusers ? instead of redress, have indictments ? instead of political liberty, persecution and prisons ? and instead of personal security under the law, and while obeying the law, are they to behold a continued suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* Act ;
exposing

exposing to the horrors of a dungeon, and to the malevolence of wicked ministers, every individual whom those ministers may think fit to proscribe? And are not even these accumulated injuries and insults sufficient? Must invention itself be set to work, to contrive indignity? Must mockery and contempt be imported from rocks and mountains yielding no other produce? While Englishmen in vain petition for a Reform in their House of Commons, are they to behold their own Commanders bestow on the half-savage conquered CORSICANS, a Constitution founded on AN EQUAL AND SUBSTANTIAL REPRESENTATION IN ANNUAL PARLIAMENTS; such Constitution acceded to by his Majesty; and confirmed and ratified by a British Legislature!—If after this, O Englishmen, ye suffer the present session of parliament to pass, without piling up your *Petitions of Right*, till they reach the very ceiling of the House of Commons; and, claiming the representation that is due to you, ye raise not your voice till it thunder into silence every voice opposing, ye may talk about liberty, but ye know it not!—Ye may dream of constitutions and of rights, but ye are fit only for the yoke that is prepared for your neck!

Having no observations to make on the French revolution but what have incidentally occurred already,

INTRODUCTION.

clvii

already, we may now proceed to the last topic on which I have undertaken to speak in this Introduction.

SECTION IV.

Mr. Young's ideas on the use and benefit of Associations.

TO the most shallow observer, who has not implicitly surrendered up his understanding to the guidance of others, it must now, as I conceive, be apparent, that, under an insidious mask of neutrality, our ministers from the first bore in their hearts inveterate hostility towards the French revolution in all its stages; because of the principles of political liberty on which it was founded, and which they feared were finding their way hither, and were leading us to a reform in the representation of this country; which could not, as they thought, be prevented, but by plunging into a war with *France*, crushing at once her new-born freedom, and restoring once more that despotism under which she had so long groaned. It must also, I imagine, be equally evident, that, for the last three years at least, this same hostility to the principles of liberty has engaged our ministers, together with their real lords and sovereigns the Borough-mongers, in a deep-laid, settled, active, and persevering conspiracy against the last remains of the constitution.

exposing to the horrors of a dungeon, and to the malevolence of wicked ministers, every individual whom those ministers may think fit to proscribe? And are not even these accumulated injuries and insults sufficient? Must invention itself be set to work, to contrive indignity? Must mockery and contempt be imported from rocks and mountains yielding no other produce? While Englishmen in vain petition for a Reform in their House of Commons, are they to behold their own Commanders bestow on the half-savage conquered CORSICANS, a Constitution founded on AN EQUAL AND SUBSTANTIAL REPRESENTATION IN ANNUAL PARLIAMENTS; such Constitution acceded to by his Majesty; and confirmed and ratified by a British Legislature!—If after this, O Englishmen, ye suffer the present session of parliament to pass, without piling up your *Petitions of Right*, till they reach the very ceiling of the House of Commons; and, claiming the representation that is due to you, ye raise not your voice till it thunder into silence every voice opposing, ye may talk about liberty, but ye know it not!—Ye may dream of constitutions and of rights, but ye are fit only for the yoke that is prepared for your neck!

Having no observations to make on the French revolution but what have incidentally occurred already,

INTRODUCTION. civil

already, we may now proceed to the last topic on which I have undertaken to speak in this Introduction.

SECTION IV.

Mr. Young's ideas on the use and benefit of Associations.

TO the most shallow observer, who has not implicitly surrendered up his understanding to the guidance of others, it must now, as I conceive, be apparent, that, under an insidious mask of neutrality, our ministers from the first bore in their hearts inveterate hostility towards the French revolution in all its stages; because of the principles of political liberty on which it was founded, and which they feared were finding their way hither, and were leading us to a reform in the representation of this country; which could not, as they thought, be prevented, but by plunging into a war with *France*, crushing at once her new-born freedom, and restoring once more that despotism under which she had so long groaned. It must also, I imagine, be equally evident, that, for the last three years at least, this same hostility to the principles of liberty has engaged our ministers, together with their real lords and sovereigns the Borough-mongers, in a deep-laid, settled, active, and persevering conspiracy against the last remains of the constitution.

And he who shall carefully read *The Example of France a Warning to Britain*, and compare it with the whole chain of events since its first publication, will not, in my mind, want complete evidence of that pamphlet's having been one of the leading and main links of the conspiracy I speak of. Could it, on its first appearance, have been considered by sober-minded men as the raving of a mad apostate, bitten by as mad an alarmist, and the mere effusion of an unconnected, unsteady, bewildered mind; the regular system which has since taken place,—the proclamations, the delusions, the persecuting associations, the war, the aristocratic armings, the infamous accusations of plots and treasons, the Secret Committees, the false imprisonments, the scandalous prosecutions, and the trials that followed, forbid us any longer to doubt of the writer's having been one of the first and most active instruments in the conspiracy I speak of.

In a conspiracy so foul, and in favour of a gang so contemptible, no manly appeal, no rational arguments could be addressed to the unbiaſſed judgment of Englishmen; nor could their unprejudiced understandings be entrusted with the secrets of the nefarious system to be established. If any hope could be entertained, it must wholly rest on the ability to impose on their credulity, by misrepresentation and the boldness of unfounded assertion;

to

to mislead their understandings, by the deceptions of sophistry; to warp their judgment by a perversion of facts and of language; to inflame their passions by false and impudent accusations against the true friends of freedom and the constitution; and ultimately, to make them—the people of England—the prejudiced dupes of imposture and delusion, and the frantic destroyers of their own liberties.—Such then, is the character of the pamphlet before us; of which I have already given some proof; and it only remains for me to produce one specimen more in confirmation of my sentiments; and to shew how evidently the author was the precursor of another accuser, in the attack so formidably and so rancorously made upon our liberties; and so gloriously, so providentially defeated by the integrity of English Juries.

“ In the rational terror of a perilous moment,
“ when struck with a common sensation of common danger, men fly to association, to secure
“ themselves against the attacks of men already
“ associated to destroy them :* at such an instant,
“ what can be so futile, what can be such imbe-

* This wicked calumny stands now contradicted by two years experience, and by the evidence of the very spies and informers set to work to discover these pretended *destroyers*, and who had complete means of knowing their designs, provided such men had existed.

“ cility,

“ cility, as to seek, by an ill-timed complaisance
 “ of candour, so to express their feelings, that as-
 “ sociators of a direct contrary complexion, men
 “ who professedly seek to *change** the constitution
 “ on French principles (for there has not been a
 “ single proposition of reform that is not on those
 “ principles†), that such men may be induced hy-
 “ pocritically to unite with you? The weakness of
 “ such a proceeding is inexcusable. On the con-
 “ trary, all these declarations ought to have been

* I do not remember a single reformer, except Mr. *Young*, who has told us that the constitution itself is *really bad in theory*. (p. 451, 452,) *deficient, worthless*, (See p. cxxxvi of this Introduction) and requires to be *changed*.

† What the author can mean by this assertion, is incomprehensible; when we recollect the Duke of *Richmond*'s bill of 1780; Mr. *Pitt*'s motions of 1782, 1783, and 1785; the Conventions in London in 1780 and 1781; and the numerous Associations, proceedings and petitions of those times; so long preceding any idea of a revolution in France, and while French principles were those of despotism only:—Can Mr. *Young* forget all these things, and the infinity of *propositions* published on the subject? Can he forget his own “ *propositions of reform?*” Besides an intire plan of reform given in the *People's Barrier*, a book quoted by Mr. *Young*, and published in 1780. I have now before me another treatise, which I published in 1777, on the same subject. If French principles are *not* those of political liberty, Mr. *Young* would have done well, to have given us *the principles themselves*, and a refutation of them; but contenting himself with abusing principles which he never exhibits, for ought that his readers can know to the contrary, they may be the same that have immortalized *Hampden*, *Sidney*, and *Locke*.

“ so

“ so framed, as expressly and purposely to exclude
 “ a union with men so dangerous, as those who
 “ would not feel *a horror* at the idea of *tampering*
 “ *with* the constitution, at such a season as this :*
 “ —by such an exclusion, it would be found,
 “ that, however numerous the reformers were
 “ before the 10th of August, at present not one
 “ man in a thousand would listen, with patience,
 “ to hear the word reform seriously pronounced ;
 “ nor fail to deprecate the idea, as pregnant with
 “ national ruin.”† (p. 146.)

“ There is one object in associations which has
 “ not been thought of, but which would, perhaps,
 “ be as useful and effective as any other, and that
 “ is, for associators to resolve against dealing with
 “ any sort of *Jacobin tradesmen* :‡ if the atrocity of
 “ attempts

? Horrible, indeed, to think of disputing the right of a clandestine, fraudulent faction, to wrest from the king, lords, and people the government of the country !

† When Mr. *Young* shall see *England* covered with French armies, and the multitude balancing in their minds, whether to fight for the Borough-monger usurpation, or to imitate the conduct of the Brabanters and the Dutch, perhaps he may, when too late, repent of having acted the part of a public deceiver, deprecating the idea of reforming a constitution, which so lately he told us must undergo some *change*, or *it was much to be dreaded it would ruin the nation*.

‡ A pretty mark to set on a man, to point him out for desertion, proscription and beggary !—A more infamous mode of rendering

“ attempts to alter a constitution, which so effectually
 “ ally protects property, as that of *England* does,*
 “ on comparison with any other that *Europe* sees,
 “ be well considered, the supineness of mankind,
 “ in giving encouragement to those whose utmost
 “ efforts are aimed at its destruction, will surely
 “ appear the most marvellous stupidity,” &c.
 (p. 147.)

“ The question is, does the freedom of the
 “ press—or ought that freedom to extend—to an
 “ unlimited permission, for the pen of every man
 “ who wishes public confusion, to vilify, abuse,
 a man obnoxious, sure never was invented!—A more profligate
 species of persecution, sure never was practised!—What was a
definition of Jacobin principles, when Mr. *Young* was elected into
 the society? What was a *definition* of those principles when, two
 years and a half afterwards, he published his book without re-
 tracting them?—What *definition* has he since given of those prin-
 ciples, by which it is possible to know what is the guilt he im-
 puts to those he is pleased to nick-name Jacobins? If he will
 say that Jacobin and Reformer are synonymous terms, then where
 is the guilt? If he will maintain that both appellations describe
 criminality, the common sense and common honesty of mankind
 will give him the lie. If it be his intention to involve in his
 vague and indecent accusations of aiming at the destruction of
 the constitution, every man who conscientiously pleads for re-
 forming its corruptions, he is a base calumniator,—an apostate,
 as unprincipled as contemptible.

* By consulting Appendix, No. II, the reader will see under
 Mr. *Young*'s own hand, how well property sometimes is protected
 in England.

“ and

“ and bring into contempt, with ignorant people,
 “ that glorious constitution, which is the inherit-
 “ ance and the pride of Britons? * *The Friends of*
 “ *the Liberty of the Press*, in the *inflammatory*
 “ speech, which they heard with tribunitial ap-
 “ plause, and dispersed with Jacobin industry,
 “ assert their right to publish *the corruptions of the*
 “ *constitution*, in other words *to write it down.* † It
 “ is at issue between that constitution and the peo-
 “ ple whom it renders happy on one side, and those
 “ gentlemen on the other, whether they have this
 “ right or not. ‡ The licentiousness we complain
 “ of is not of old standing; it was unknown, ex-
 “ cept in its just punishment, before the present
 “ reign; and I will never acknowledge among the
 “ benefits of a period, in which liberty has been
 “ constantly progressive, this relaxation of that
 “ constitutional rein, which government, in every
 “ preceding period, held with a commendable
 “ firmness for the good of society, order, and

* How that constitution has been vilified, abused, and brought
 into contempt, by the forgetful writer himself, we have already
 seen. I know but of one other who has treated it with so little
 ceremony; and over the sins of that author, the law did not
 sleep; but Mr. *Young*, instead of an *information*, has a *salary*,
ex officio, for his pains.

† The word *inflammatory* from the author now before us must
 make the reader smile; and this fresh specimen of his *Revolution-
 ary Logic* must be highly edifying.

‡ See the same work, p. 81.

“ peace.* To whose *indolence* and timidity such a
 “ gross evil is to be attributed I know not, but if
 “ we would preserve our constitution from Jacobin
 “ *improvements*, it must be CORRECTED with
 “ vigour,† and the sooner the business is done,
 “ so much the more salutary will be the cure.
 “ Government ought to be ready to prosecute; to
 “ punish rests with Juries,‡ who will doubtless
 “ feel the duty and importance of stopping a pest-
 “ tilence, which threatens the annihilation of all
 “ constitutional authority.” (p. 163.)

* Is the gentleman dreaming, and talking in his sleep, about
 an *unlimited permission* to write down the constitution; and about
 the want of punishments in the present reign, for exercising the
 liberty of the press with too little circumspection?

† What have we here, Mr. Young!—What, in the same breath
 are we to be told that the constitution is *not* to be improved, by
 amending our representation in parliament; but *ought* to be cor-
 rected, by giving the crown something more than its present
 power, of fining, imprisoning, and transporting to *Botany Bay*,
 those who publish the corruptions of the constitution, thinking they
 have this right!

‡ That the Juries of *Hardy*, *Tooke*, and *Thelwall* did not
 hang those persons, as a prelude to more sweeping executions,
 will never be imputed to the *indolence* of the author of the *Ex-
 ample of France*; who, to do him justice, took due and true
 pains, to prepare the minds of all Juries to punish men for being
Reformers; nor has government indeed shewn much want of
readiness to prosecute such men.

“ A free

" A free press may be properly exerted to detect
 " a minister ; but when it is allowed to vomit
 " forth the poison of such infamous doctrines,
 " levelled point blank against a constitution, the
 " safeguard and protector of a nation, rendered
 " GREAT and HAPPY by the benignity of its influ-
 " ence—in such a case the *freedom of the press* be-
 " comes the *slavery of the people*." (p. 81.) Now
 the only doctrines here referred to, are contained in
 his quotation from *Dr. Price's Observations on Civil
 Liberty*. It is as follows: " In every free state,
 " every man is his own legislator. Government
 " is an institution for the benefit of the people
 " governed, which they have power to model as
 " they please ; and to say that they can have too
 " much of this power, is to say, that there ought
 " to be a power in the state superior to that which
 " gives it being." Here we have paradox upon
 paradox, with a witness!—Paradox the first,—
 Truth is poison ; and by consequence, a true doc-
 trine is an infamous doctrine.—Paradox the se-
 cond,—a *free press* must not be permitted to pub-
 lish a doctrine essential to full political *freedom*.—
 Paradox the third,—If the press should obtain for
 the people that condition which is the *fulness of
 freedom*, then they would be in *slavery*.—Paradox
 the fourth,—When a *free press*, in order to prevent
 its publishing doctrines *essential* to freedom, is put
 13 under

under the *imprimatur* of the minister, then it may be employed with admirable effect *against* that minister.—Paradox the fifth,—The doctrine of complete personal representation is levelled point-blank *against* the English constitution; of which constitution, it is *the vital principle* carried to its *full perfection*, that “law, to bind all, must be assented “to by all.”*

The principle of personal representation being a file which breaks the teeth of every one that bites at it, the author is not rash enough to bite, but only flavers the tooth-breaking file, with the drivings of his *revolutionary logic*. His encounter, on the present occasion, consists of five parts;—1st, a sneering appeal to “the whole of the French “revolution,” as “a paraphrase on the text;”—2d, abusing Doctor *Price*, as a “reverend fire-brand;”—3d, expressions of *utter contempt* for “all these theories of liberty;”—4th, boldly asserting in the very face of truth and of fact, (notoriously such in the case of *America*) that “No “constitution or government could exist, while the “people had the power to model it at pleasure; “for they *never had* such a power, without being “in its *perpetual exercise*; and a constitution perpetually changed, is not government, but anar-

* Princ. Leg. et Eq. p. 56.

“chy;”^{*} and 5th, an *angry lamentation* over “the mischief of a licentious press.”—Cease, O ye sages of science, to pursue on the strong pinions of superior intellect, and through the dazzling, æthærial regions of abstract reasoning, that idol, TRUTH:—’tis better a priori to fix on your conclusion; and then, mounted on this mettled steed,—this *revolutionary logic*, you may gallop to it full speed, be the premises before you what they may!

Personal representation being indeed the only possible *basis* of free government, a due attention to the superstructure may soon give *France* as great felicity as that to which *America* has attained. What wants she that is not in her power?—A sort of senate of revision, without whose concurrence, after two distinct readings and discussions, no law should have force. Such a senate might not only have this office, of revising the laws in detail, as proposed; but be required also to revise, and report upon them in gross, once a year; with a view to simplicity, perspicuity, prudence and justice; that so law itself might never become a snare and a burthen to the people. This senate to be a tribunal *only* in cases of impeachment; because decid-

* See p. li. and cxlix of this Introduction. Well might Mr. Godwin sing the praises of *anarchy*; since it is *anarchy*, according to Mr. Young, which gives to the Americans such peace, freedom and happiness, as no nation before ever experienced!

ing on causes brought from courts of law and equity, favours too much of uniting the judicial with the legislative functions. It ought not to be an ordinary judicature; but the judge of judges when they perverted the law.—*France* also wants an executive, that shall at once be responsible, and yet protected from light accusation, or trial too easily obtained by factious men. The best securities to the executive, will be in prevention; by guarding the Council against their own vices. All acts of state should be determined by *vote*; aye, or no; each member subscribing his name in the proper column, under a penalty for omission. The whole proceedings of the Council to be once a year submitted to the inspection of a small Secret Committee of the National Assembly; appointed with great solemnity. It should be the duty of this Committee to pass over mere errors, not amounting in their judgment, to matter of criminal accusation; and in case of discovering such matter, the Committee then to be increased to treble its original number, and the votes of two-thirds be made necessary for moving an impeachment. When *France* has it in her power, by a few judicious regulations, to give steadiness to her vigorous government, what rash and criminal delusion it is, to represent to the people of this country, that she is the sport of an anarchy which must end in her speedy ruin!

—“ The men who feel, with the deepest chagrin,
 “ the security such associations give to the con-
 “ stitution, *as at present established*, have nothing
 “ left during the vigour now exerted, but to re-
 “ tort accusations—and to tell us, that we mean,
 “ or act as if we meant, to render the king abso-
 “ lute:* but such assertions scarcely merit atten-
 “ tion: those men, if there are such, who wished
 “ before to change our government to a despotism,
 “ certainly wish it now; but that associations
 “ *directly declaring* a determination to maintain the
 “ constitution *as it is*—free as it is now—mean
 “ really an intention to overthrow it,† is too pre-
 “ postorous to be credited, and worthy of the re-
 “ forming quarter only from which it proceeds.”
 (p. 164.)

* O no:—the king absolute! God help him, poor man; it is keeping the constitution “ *as it is*,” that keeps his Majesty in a state of dependance on a base faction, whose insolent usurpation on every branch of the government, nought but a reform in the representation can do away. Neither king, lords, nor people can be free, until the corps of Borough-mongers are broken and disbanded.

† That the Associations under the auspices and influence of that Pretorian Band of the British Empire, mean “ to give security to the constitution *as at present established*,”—if those words mean, *as at present corrupted and consigned as a property to a faction of one hundred and fifty-four*,—is our true complaint; and this *being* our complaint, how can we be so ignorant, as to impute to any men “ an intention to overthrow” the constitution?

“ Associations,

“ Associations directly *declaring* a determination” says Mr. *Young*; and that they should not mean what they declare, “ is too preposterous to be credited.” I am glad the gentleman now thinks men’s declarations *ought to be believed*, when there is no proof that their real meaning is other than what they profess. Whatever may be his readiness to believe these associators, he is not so very prone to take the word of the reformers*, of which I have produced some pretty strong instances, and many more might easily be collected. —“ It is not the rank Jacobin, with bare and bloody arms, pike in hand, and ready for your throat; it is his gentleman-usher, your modest reformer, who, meaning *a great deal*, asks *a little*, and knows how to make that little much. But be not so cajoled—resist ALL CHANGES in that constitution, which gives you the means of wealth, and protects you in the enjoyment. Come to resolutions declaratory of the abhorrence of changes; and for every proposition for

* “ For men to tell us, in such a moment as this, and situated as we are with the enemy of mankind on one side, and the torch of revolt lighting in Ireland on another side, that they are not Jacobins, but moderate men, wishing *reform*, is as impudent as it would be for a thief to say, that he is not an assassin, because he only holds a candle while another cuts my throat.” (p. 175.)

“ them that does not originate in the legislature ;
 “ and petition parliament *to render illegal all meet-*
 “ *ings and clubs*, whose object is to make experi-
 “ ments on British happiness ; to discover rights
 “ better than those of an Englishman ; to change
 “ your laws, religion and government ; and give
 “ you, in lieu of them, the NEW LIGHTS OF
 “ FRENCH PHILOSOPHY.” (p. 148).

“ It appears to me, that there would be a sin-
 “ gular propriety in the associations which are at
 “ present spreading through the kingdom, peti-
 “ tioning parliament to pass an act *to declare all*
 “ *clubs, associations, societies, and meetings of men,*
 “ *that assemble for the purpose of obtaining changes*
 “ *in the constitution, illegal,*”* &c. (p. 174.)

“ Join in associations for our defence, against
 “ banditti, cut-throats, and Jacobins ; join against
 “ an enemy more subtle, and therefore more dan-
 “ gerous, the friends of reform ; the associators
 “ who would plant the tree of equal liberty ; the
 “ mountebanks who have a French nostrum, and
 “ *Birmingham daggers*, for the diseases of an Eng-

* But not *these* petitioning “ associations directly declaring a
 “ determination to maintain the constitution *as it is*,” that is,
 according to Mr. Young, *bad in theory ; deficient ; worthless ;*
 and that which, *if not changed, must ruin the nation.*

“ lish

lish constitution. Guard against such miscreant
“ attempts by pointed resolutions; *and call, with*
“ *one voice, on the legislature to suppress, by vigorous*
“ *and decisive laws, the clubs of sedition,*” &c.
(p. 179.) “ To suppress at once, by vigorous
“ and decisive measures, such hot-beds of sedition
“ and plunder, is the first duty of parliament.”
(p. 67.)

When, duly attending to Mr. *Young's* earnestness for suppressing all popular societies, and his hints for an imprimatur on the press, or some other invention to answer the same end, we compare his language with what we heard on the late trials, and had been used to for some time before, from the advocates and panegyrists of the rotten-borough system; we have no doubt but that completely, and for ever, to have silenced the voice of reform, so unwelcome to the ear of guilt, was a leading object in that nefarious conspiracy against our liberties, of which I have taken some notice, and on which I have more to say in the progress of this work. That the records of that conspiracy have not been written in innocent blood, certainly has not been owing either to “ *indolence or timidity*” in those who planned the project, or in those whose office it was to keep up that spirit of delusion and prejudice, on which success was necessarily to depend.

But

INTRODUCTION. - clxxiii

But in allowing the author, of whom I shall now take my leave for a while, the merit of diligence and the praise of genius, it is yet a declaration which I owe to truth, to say, that with regard to fidelity, argument and candour, I remember not so wretched a performance from so able a hand. It is difficult, I know, to contend against truth; but still genius will generally command respect. To account, therefore, for the extreme defects of the work under consideration, I believe I must once more crave assistance from a certain well-informed traveller, who, speaking of the French, under the monarchy, observes, “ they
“ have no notion of private people going out of
“ their way for the public good, without being
“ paid by the public; nor could he well compre-
“ hend me, when I told him that every thing is
“ well done in *England*, except what is done with
“ public money.”

* *Young's Travels*, p. 92.

THE
COMMONWEALTH
IN DANGER.

THE tremendously awful situation in which, as a people, we now stand, must arrest the attention of every thinking man. It has arrested that of the writer. Abroad, we are involved in a war, new in all its characters, and of an aspect truly alarming: at home, we are disunited, without much ground to hope for a cordial reunion; unless a due sense of the common danger shall bring us into better temper, remind us of the duty of mutually allowing for past errors, and beget, not only a more charitable interpretation of one another's present designs, but a conscientious endeavour to divest ourselves of the prejudices of party, and to devote our utmost powers, and exert our united endeavours, to save the state.

Under the present melancholy circumstances of the country, who shall say that *Britain* will prove
B equal

equal to the contest which seems to await her? Mr. *Young*, in the *Annals of Agriculture*, No. 129, has lately drawn a picture of the French republic which merits our most serious regard; and calls upon us in terms that cannot be resisted, to look well, and without delay, to the security of our own island. But as some of that gentleman's reasonings seem exceptionable; and as his principal proposal for our domestic safety falls, in my opinion, somewhat short of what the nature of the case, and the times, require, the following remarks and suggestions are offered to the public.

According to Mr. *Young*, the French republic, through unforeseen causes, is at length become of a description which makes it in fact, as to its nature and essence, what the wonderful republic of *Sparta* was in antient times. But inasmuch as the territory of *France*, especially if it shall be extended to the *Zwyder Zee*, will be of infinitely greater magnitude than the petty state of *Laconia*, not exceeding in extent the county of Lincoln; so the power of this new republic must be infinitely more formidable to all its neighbours, than was that with which it is compared. Its very existence, considering its own internal diseases, and the prodigious force externally employed to destroy it in the cradle, is matter of astonishment to the courts and people
of

of *Europe*. What then must they think of the gigantic size and energy to which it has so soon attained! nothing *modern* can resist its power. All fortifications of nature and of art fall before it. Wherever appear the numerous and veteran armies of their enemies, the republican legions, like torrents of lava,* pour down and overwhelm them. Such effects must have causes; and Mr. *Young*, who had expected other consequences from the war, is led by his disappointment and the surprize it occasioned, into an investigation of those causes; although his principal inquiry is, how to avert the danger to ourselves from an enemy so formidable.

Before I proceed to this part of our subject, I shall just observe, and it is what Mr. *Young* seems to think, that the present energy of *France* is simply the result of *republican government* and *arming her people*. The cause of manifesting this energy is *war*. And the cause of the war—that I leave to be explained by Mr. *Young* and others more acquainted with the motives of ministers than myself. Whether the war could, or could not have been avoided, consistently with the duty of ministers to their country, is a question which every one must

* The grand expression of Mr. *Young*.

4 THE COMMONWEALTH

decide for himself as well as he can.* The common arguments on this head take us, in general, no farther back than to the period of our own interference in a war commenced by other parties. But when we contemplate that enlarged wisdom and foresight which belongs to the character of statesmen, perhaps the question cannot be properly decided, without ascending to a higher period of time. The period to which I allude, is that at which the French king accepted the constitution in 1791.† On the point under consideration I wish to speak with diffidence. I do not want unjustly to criminate any men; nor to add to our unhappy divisions. But if the war by the influence of British counsels might have been prevented, if our statesmen should have any recollections of having had the opportunity and the means, they must now I trust be disposed, on reviewing scenes of which no tongue can describe the horrors, to sheath as soon as possible the cruel sword.

At the time then, of the French king's acceptance of the constitution, was not the peaceful,

* "The temperate mode in which the French conducted themselves in the beginning of the dispute, and the insufferable and puerile arrogance of our ministry, will be seen in the correspondence between M. *Chauvelin* and lord *Grenville*, which is inserted in our state papers." New Annual Register, 1793, page 35.

† September the 13th.

bloodless revolution thereby accomplished, the joy of the public heart, and a theme of general congratulation and praise in this country? Was it not a period when a closer alliance with *France* would have been acceptable to this nation? Might not British statesmen have conceived the intrigues and attempts which were likely to take place for overthrowing the new liberties of *France*; and the probabilities that even *war* would be amongst the means resorted to? Had the interests of royalty and liberty in that country found advocates in their bosoms; had the peace of *Europe* employed their thoughts; and the quiet and prosperity of *Great Britain*, so dependent on general harmony, called forth their anxious cares and forecast for their preservation; what could have been more natural, politic and honourable, than to have stepped forward with alacrity as sincere and cordial friends, to have supported the tottering infancy of French freedom, and to have manifested in the eyes of *Europe* that the preservation of that freedom and of general tranquility could not to *Britain* be objects of indifference? Had such been their magnanimous and glorious policy, it seems even more than probable that the war would not have taken place; that the constitution of 1789 would gradually have taken root; and that *Louis XVI.* might at this day have been the first magistrate of a free people.

Or had our ministers less generous sentiments? Did the supposed weakness of a rival nation tempt them to a cold and insidious neutrality, waiting for the confusions it was to produce, and of which they meant to take advantage, for purposes of national aggrandizement and patronage? And had they also motives referable to domestic reforms that were likely to press upon them; unless by connivance at continental preparations for hostility, they could so manage as to have the nation necessarily involved in a war, which should at its commencement be falsely attributed to unforeseen causes, and at the same time furnish them with plenty of swords for parrying the thrusts of reforming petitions? * These are questions on which I presume not to decide. If there are hearts which they can touch, they may

* “ We have reason to believe that the intervention of the
 “ war with France, and the alarms, whether well or ill founded,
 “ which have prevailed throughout England, during the last
 “ winter, and which we have no doubt were excited and in-
 “ flamed for the special purpose of checking the disposition of the
 “ country in favour of a reform, and of *calumniating the characters*
 “ of those who promoted it. These we believe are the true
 “ causes of that silence and inactivity on the part of the nation,
 “ which have been objected to us in parliament.” *Authentic*
Copy of a Petition to Parliament, presented to the House of Commons on
the 6th May, 1793, &c. Printed for D. Stewart, Frith-street,
 Soho.

It has since been seen to what all this calumny tended. How
 inestimable that palladium of English liberty—*trial by Jury!*

then

then be of use. If not, it is the better for our country; and we shall have the firmer ground for such a reconciliation of parties at this fearful moment, as the exigency of our situation seems to require.

Let us now return to Mr. *Young*, from whom we collect; 1st, That the force of France is "greater than in any former period, and Europe "trembling around;*" 2d, That a natural result to be expected is, that this force, in consequence of the peculiarities of its origin, will "dash in "pieces the whole fabric of European trade and "industry which has taken three centuries to "form;"* 3d, "That annihilation is the palpable fate of the whole body of landlords" in this and the other civilised countries;* 4th, That we require an "union of all that is respectable "in the kingdom to oppose that united mass of "atrociousness which threatens to overthrow every established government, and sweep from its very "basis all that renders mankind superior to brutes;"* 5th, "While war is decidedly for the interest of every man in arms, and every man in "power, will they readily have recourse to peace—

* Annals of Agriculture, No. 129, Pages 281, 283, 284, 287.

“ will they not more probably determine that
 “ there never shall be any such thing? ”* 6th, “ A
 “ war vibrating in its events would be the most
 “ favourable to the establishment ”* of a sys-
 tem in *France* similar to that of *Sparta* or *Laco-*
nia; “ and every one knows that *Laconia* was but
 “ a great camp, with no employment but arms for
 “ every free man in it; ”* and he adds, the
 manners of the French are changed; “ the equality
 “ which is introduced, and the banishment, death,
 “ or ruin of all who had fortunes, &c. have esta-
 “ blished a simplicity, a ferocity, and a hardy
 “ courage, that may have effects, if not entirely
 “ similar to the institutions of *Lycurgus*, sufficiently
 “ so to render *France* a camp and its soldiers the
 “ terror of the world.” 7th, “ But the circum-
 “ stance most interesting is, the enormity, re-
 “ sources, extent, and energy of the force which
 “ has thus been created,”* which, “ ought
 “ to alarm every individual that has property in
 “ any country of the globe; ” “ that this force has
 “ been greatly underrated,” and “ its manifesta-
 “ tion ought to increase the terror of all its neigh-
 “ bours.” 8th, That the incredible resources
 “ created in *France* ” are “ upon principles that

* Annals of Agriculture, No. 129, Pages 293, 289, 296,
 294.

“ set all experience and all ancient policy at defiance.*”

Such are the outlines of our danger. We will now attend to the means pointed out by Mr. *Young*, as our security.

9th. As the power of *France* “ is absolutely inconsistent with the safety of her neighbours,” and “ incompatible with the existence of property in any country of Europe;”* “ the republican system,” must not be allowed to “ establish itself permanently,” but must be “ opposed with the most determined vigour, and on principles as energetic as its own.”† 10th, The first proposed imitation of conventional energy, is either to silence all societies professing to meet “ to reform abuses,”* or to let them count amongst “ the wretches in prisons.” 11th, To enrol, arm and officer a militia of “ Five hundred thousand” men;* “ fortify our advantageous posts to an impregnable strength; and con-

* It is plain they set at defiance the experience and calculations of Mr. *Young*, who in his *Example of France*, p. 185, 186, 187, thought he had given a complete statement of them; and thence proved the utter impossibility of their carrying on the war.

† Annals of Agriculture, No. 129, Pages 289, 300, 301.

strut

THE COMMONWEALTH

*“fruct a capacious citadel near the capital.”** As
“to imagine that we should be able long to pre-
“serve ourselves were other nations ruined and
“enslaved by the French system, would be a vain
“idea, nothing probably can save the world but
“such a concert of every power in Europe as has
“not yet taken place.” 13th, A new *experiment* of
military quixotism is to be tried for CONQUERING
FRANCE: we must “penetrate by the *Seine* to
“*Paris* ;*” *Dunkirk*, *Gravelines*, and *Calais*” ought
to have been “conquered” in our former cam-
paigns, “the inhabitants all driven out, and the
“places peopled entirely with emigrants ;”* “when
“*Russia* moves, as move she must in time, *Russian*
“auxiliaries might be landed at once in the heart
“of *France* ;* and “if the Convention in the mean
“time attacked *Germany* or the eastern line of
“*Flanders*, the country should have been made a
“desart, at the expence of the common cause ;”*
but as “no force or principle of attack can be
“rationally expected to have effect, if the people
“in *France*, disaffected to the Convention, are
“not induced to give their aid to those who come
“to their assistance ;” so “a MANIFESTO of future
“liberty consistent with royalty should be *held out*
“to them as the ONLY object of the allies.”*

* Annals of Agriculture, No. 129, Pages 302, 303, 304,
305, 306, 308.

After thus exhorting and instructing the cabinets of *Europe*, and attempting to comfort his countrymen with the hopes that may be entertained, of re-establishing monarchy on the ruins of jacobinism* in *France*; he seems, however, to have had some presages of the little reliance we could have on our allies. "That general concert and common feeling," says he, "which ought to cement in the strictest bands an alliance of different powers, *which has been so often looked for and so rarely attained*, can ALONE render the war successful; if the present call for new measures and new principles be not sufficient to insure it, the hope is for ever delusive. If our allies are not sensible of their danger; if there is only a common languid exertion at a moment which demands an unexampled vigour, *it is beyond the power of Britain to supply the deficiency*. SUCH A SITUATION DEMANDS DOUBLE ATTENTION TO THE MEANS OF PROVIDING FOR THE DEFENCE OF THIS ISLAND†, &c."

* I use the author's favourite word, without, I confess, knowing what it means; because it seems to comprehend, as applied by him, meanings the most opposite; viz. a respect for liberty, and a lust of despotic power; a desire of reform and of purity, and a thirst for anarchy and blood. Here it may be taken to mean simply, that species of republicanism which excludes royalty from the composition of government.

† Annals of Agriculture, No. 129, Page 308.

Is this, then, the goal to which the wisdom of ministers has conducted the nation! Is this our "indemnity for the past, and security for the future!" Is this the report to be made to a *confiding* House of Commons! But what shall I say of my country at large, which has with so wonderful an infatuation given its sanction to this work of madness and of blood! *Quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat.*

If the recent remembrance of *one hundred and twenty-one* millions of money and rivers of blood lavished in the iniquitous attempt to establish taxation without representation, with its disgraceful event; if a debt of three hundred millions * sterling, with a yearly taxation exceeding the whole yearly rent of the soil; and if a petition to the House of Commons offering proof at the bar of that House, that *it does not represent the People*;† if these

* With the additions of the present war it now exceeds this sum.

† The words are, "Your Petitioners, in affirming that your Honourable House is not an adequate representation of the People of England, do but state a fact, which, if the word 'Representation' be accepted in its fair and obvious sense, they are ready to prove, and which they think detrimental to their interests, and contrary to the spirit of the constitution." The correct and candid Mr. Young, who, for the purpose of acrimonious

these considerations have been insufficient to awaken *Britain* to a sense of some impending calamity, I fear that although an *Hampden*, or an *Alfred* were to rise from the dead to give her counsel, she would not listen to their voice. The nation's inconsistency, is not amongst the smallest tokens of its latent disease. The writings of a pamphleteer can throw it into agonies of apprehension; but neither the discomfiture nor treachery of its allies; the flight of its armies; nor the rolling forward of that irresistible torrent of military lava poured from the volcanic bosom of *France*, which threatens it with extinction as a people, can do more than barely suffice to give some zest to the news of the day. O, Influence, how fascinating thy powers! O, Corruption, how extended thy sway!

Where now are our Alarmists?—our loyal Associations?—worn out with cares and watchings, to circumvent those desperate men, the Reformers, do they now sleep? Hear they not the trumpet, whose sound they so lately obeyed with such pa-

nious abuse, quotes this passage in his usual way, that is, *not in the words of the author*, (p. 200) says, (and no farther off than in the preceding page) “They make no distinction between a “government, and *the principles* of that government; which is “neither more nor less than nonsense.” Now it should seem that the *distinction* is theirs, and the *nonsense* his.

triotic alacrity? or is its note so changed they know not its voice! * I hope these gentlemen do not forget that the peace and property, the lives, liberties and religion of Englishmen, are at this time of as much value as when we entered into the war and invaded *France*, in defence of those blessings: and that when the French, in their turn, may actually become the invaders, it may be somewhat too late to have their plans of resistance then to concert. They ought in good time to be aware, that *Paine* and *Picbegrú* are to be dealt with in two very different ways. It is therefore seriously to be recommended to these associations, to lose no time in assembling, in order to consult THAT LAW and THAT CONSTITUTION to which they are so firmly attached, on the preparatory measures to be taken towards the safety of our island; and to communicate the result of their inquiries to the country at large. There are sundry valuable tracts, which would greatly assist them on such an occasion; but I would particularly recommend to their notice, “*A Discourse on a national and constitutional Force;*” by the present *Lord Hawkesbury*; and “*An Inquiry into the LEGAL mode of suppressing Riots; with a*

¶ * “Those who have attempted to persuade us, that we are in danger in this war, from the strength and vigour of republican France, have their motives for such an opinion;” *Example of France, a Warning to Britain*, Fourth edition, Published in 1794.

“con-

"*constitutional plan of future defence*," by Sir William Jones, now a Judge in the Supreme Court of Bengal; a *Plan of Association, on constitutional principles, for the parishes, tythings, hundreds, and counties of Great Britain* ;* and some publications on the same subject by Mr. Granville Sharpe.

If I err not, it will be found, that *the vital and essential part* of a plan of national defence, is what every householder will not only discover to be *permitted to him*, but *required of him*, by the law, as a sacred duty he owes his country. Unless prepared as the law points out, he can neither aid the civil power with *effect* in suppressing riots or insurrection; nor at the call of his sovereign defend his country against foreign invaders. Why it hath not "*for the three last centuries*," been the practice of ministers to make these uses of the loyalty of the people; and why they have suffered the antient laws for peace and defence to sink into disuse and forgetfulness, Lord Hawkebury (p. 65.) will inform the inquisitive.

Apprehending that it is already too late, by reason of the desertion of our allies and subsidiaries, to concert with Mr. Young on the execution of his military plans for restoring liberty and royalty in

* Published in 1780, by Kearsley.

France; but that we are brought precisely into that situation which, he thinks, "DEMANDS DOUBLE
"ATTENTION TO THE MEANS OF PROVIDING
"FOR THE DEFENCE OF THIS ISLAND;" we are to presume that something yet more efficacious than arming *five hundred thousand men* is in his opinion necessary; for such was the force recommended, while he reckoned upon such a concert of the European powers "*as has not yet taken place,*" and an army of "*Russians to be landed at once in the heart of France.*"

Now, while it follows from that gentleman's own premises, that continuing the war must be the likeliest means of bringing to a dreadful maturity that giant whose very infancy not all the hosts of *Europe* can resist, surely such a proposal could not have been the effect of sober counsel; but wears the features of that sort of courage which desperation alone inspires. A more sedate fortitude now becomes us. It will be time enough to give the reins to our fury, when upon British soil we shall be called on to conquer or to die. If we are to meet the war at our own gates; if Britons are to bleed defending their own lands and laws, families and firesides, I trust that we shall be found equal to the task. Men with a free constitution in their hearts, and swords in their hands, are not to be conquered.

But

But knowing the solid, concentrated "wedge-like force" of our enemy's phalanx, to be victorious, we must be united. Dissention must be put away: and mutual confidence once more taken to our bosoms. Squinting suspicion and polluted treachery must no longer be our torment and disgrace; but the generous, manly openness of free men again become our characteristic. Internal alarm, thank God and our laws, begins to subside: and I trust will leave nothing behind it to prevent a reconciliation of parties. **THE ENEMY IS AT THE GATE, AND WE MUST BE FRIENDS, OR PERISH.** Adversity is the school of the sublime virtues. Necessity is an eloquent reconciler of differences. By means the most simple, she bends the will, and enlightens the understanding. By saying to Britain, **BE AN ARMED NATION**, she secures her defence, and seals her freedom. A million of armed men* supporting the state with their purse, and defending it with their lives, will know that none have so great a stake as themselves in the government; nor more right to have a voice in the direction of affairs. The circle of representation will consequently be at least co-extensive with the circle of arms. Hence arming the people, and reforming parliament, are inseparable.

* Such at least will be our force, as soon as we resort to the true original principles of our Saxon constitution.

But some distempered imaginations will have it, that the third estate ought not to be created by, to represent, or be responsible to the people themselves; and are wild and inflammatory enough to assert, that such a representation, if once effected, must abolish the Lords and dismiss the King. These affected fears are to be referred to the same impure source, from whence flowed the insidious policy, "for the last three centuries," of disarming the people. Had Mr. *Young* seven years ago proclaimed that *five hundred thousand men* ought to be instantly armed in this country, he might by many have been thought a fit inhabitant for the Tower, or for Bedlam; and the constitutional truth he uttered, would doubtless have been treated as other constitutional truths have lately been treated in a certain book.* Now in the imaginary scale of dangers to the king and the nobles, that of a free House of Commons would probably at least be somewhat remote. It would operate, as may be supposed by those who entertain the idea, gradually, and by mere incroachment. But, according to the reasonings of our author, the danger of those privileged orders, from arming the people, must be immediate. Having then the power of destruction, they will, as he reasons, have the will; and proceed without delay to the act. If you ask why? his answer is, Go to France.

* *The example of France a warn to Britain.*

For my own part, I do not feel the force of this mode of reasoning; and before I can imagine a French hatred, antipathy, and insatiable revenge towards all men possessed of property or power, and the bloody-mindedness of Frenchmen to actuate *English* bosoms, I must suppose against notorious fact. The supposition includes centuries of despotism in the crown; intolerable oppressions and insolence from nobles as numerous and rapacious as locusts; the abominations of an idolatrous, beastly superstition, under the name of religion; an atheistical priesthood; and that deluge of national vice and impiety which must ever flow from sources so impure. I must suppose the people to bear towards the nobles and the clergy, the antipathy of women and children towards vipers and serpents. But is this a picture of the English nation?—Is it a picture of any nation that ever appeared on earth except France?—Did an armed Roman people abolish Patricians? Did the iron Spartans dismiss *hereditary* Kings? * Do the armed American people level property and dissolve government?

C 2

When

* “ Look through the annals of the world, and see if any
 “ one instance of a militia can be produced, that was seditious
 “ of itself; or of a people, who, when the sword was put into
 “ their hands, converted it to their own destruction.—Free states
 “ have almost always been subject to commotions, and the same
 “ have

When I said that *arming the people* and *reforming the parliament* are inseparable; I said it in compliment to the understandings of our ministers; for I certainly do not suspect them of the folly of *thinking*, that a British House of Commons ought not to be chosen by, to represent, and be responsible to the Commons of *Britain*. In the case then of calling those Commons to arms, I should trust to that prudence, or, as Mr. *Burke* terms it, that "civil discretion," by which the counsels of wise statesmen are governed, that on a question

"have generally been defended by a militia; but that the military establishments of such a people were the cause of their commotions can never be proved;—and though Rome had as many soldiers as citizens, tho' her senators and plebeians had frequent contests for power, where THE BALANCE WAS UNEQUALLY ADJUSTED; yet her people, when in the greatest fury, and when driven by injustice almost to despair, never once had recourse to arms; they urged their claims by supplications and secessions; and though disciplined and ready at all times to take up arms in the defence of their country, they never lifted up a hand against it; for several centuries not a life was lost amidst all their contentions; and it was not until the nature of their armies was changed, until their legions received pay, were transported into distant provinces, and never suffered to return to their domestic occupations; in a word, not until the honest Militia-men of Rome were changed into STANDING FORCES, that their contests blazed out into civil wars, destructive to the Commonwealth."

Lord Harwkebury's Discourse on a national and constitutional force, 49.

which

which has so long agitated the public mind, and now so peculiarly occupies it, they would act according to what *they believe* to be the true sense of the nation on the subject. Sanguine as I am, and have been for many years past, to see that House reformed, I shall be well content, and even desirous, that the reform may not precede the national wish. Amidst the calamities of this awful moment, when we must either arm in a mass, or cease to be a people, it is to me a consolation the most solid, that the measure of *arming*, must either set us at the same time about *reforming*; or at least obtain that most important question, *a fair bearing*. And here again, I shall trust in the wisdom of ministers. When the British Commons, by the stern voice of necessity, shall be called in a mass to arms, when they shall thereby feel and know, that, not by a minister of the war department, not by a standing army, not by any of the inventions of "the three last centuries," their liberties and constitution are to be preserved, but by THEIR OWN IMMEDIATE GUARDIANSHIP, THEIR OWN PERSONAL, INDIVIDUAL EXERTIONS, THEIR OWN UNDERSTANDINGS AND COURAGE; under such circumstances, I say, ministers will be too wise to bring themselves under a suspicion, of rewarding prostitute journalists, for incessantly scattering through the land the poison of corrupt and arbitrary doctrines; or of patronizing perverted

C 3

genius,

genius, AT THE CLOSE OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, in its lunatic attempts to *write down* the doctrine of LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION, on which the very existence of our liberties depends.

There never was a period in which we had more need than at present, seriously to consider of the means to preserve, not only the constitution, with its king, and its lords ; but our country itself, and the power of calling ourselves a people. If a conquest to *France*, we must thenceforward be what it should please *France* to make us. If there be a nation in *Europe* that this conquering Republic would choose to hold as a province ; instead of assimilating it to its own system of government, and treating it afterwards as an equal, that nation is *Great Britain* ; for in no other nation can *France* behold a RIVAL. It is the very characteristic of a boundless ambition, that it bears no rival. In exact proportion as a rival is great and formidable, such is the magnitude of their mutual enmity. But if he that is gaining the ascendant still bleeds at wounds inflicted by his adversary, aimed at his very life ; forgiveness he treats as folly ; retaliation and extirpation possess his soul. *Cæsar* had forgiveness for every Roman, *Pompey* alone excepted. *Rome* affiliated every other conquered city ; but *Carthage* she

she devoted to destruction. *Delenda est Carthago* is a language founded in nature.

At this crisis, when the allies of *Britain* seem deserting her side one by one; and all to be seeking safety by courting the friendship of *France*, can *Britain*, I say, the rival state, she who has been the sinew of the war, who has strained every nerve to knit together, and to augment the grand confederacy; can *Britain*, deserted, abandoned, impoverished, expect to have peace?—She must not entertain the hope. She must, ere long, expect to find the war in *Ireland*. She must prepare to meet the Republican armies in *Kent*, in *Hampshire*, in the west, and in the north. She has to deal with a war new in all its aspects; and with a people prolific in new ideas. They are in the familiar habit of calling old things and old places by new names; weeks they have utterly abolished; and time itself they have subjected to new denominations. Could we therefore be surprized if, as a prelude to their future designs, and as one of those strokes by which they so well know how to touch the republican mind, and to wind it up to their purpose, the Convention should transmit to their armies a decree, that thenceforward amongst Frenchmen the island of their enemy should be called *New Afric*, and its capital, *Carthage*?

But whether their intentions shall be thus manifested or not; what those intentions are but too likely to be, we know,* and indeed, if ambition and the rival spirit were wanting, there is yet another motive which may impel them to the enterprize alluded to. We have stripped them of their foreign possessions; we have destroyed their external trade; and we have annihilated in a manner every manufacture not applicable to domestic purposes and to war. What, then, is the Convention to do with the *twelve hundred thousand men* they have in the armies? If the present manufacturers and husbandmen are equal to the cultivation of the land, and to the supply of domestic and military manufactures; how is this vast soldiery, if disbanded on a sudden, to find either employment or subsistence? Is not here a danger, which in the judgment of the Convention, may be thought infinitely greater, than that of invading this island?—an island inhabited by A DISARMED DEMOCRACY, who were first basely* traduced, as disaffected to their own constitution, and then committed to the custody of the armed bodyguards of an Oligarchy, raised for defending their rotten-borough incroachments on the democratic branch of the legislature.

* Since this passage was written, our newspapers have given us conventional language, sufficiently strong to prepare us for any measure grounded on the principle of rivalry.

What

What then is there in the present posture of *England* to forbid invasion? Are there fifty thousand men in arms including the militia, and the new cavalry? Recal the fragments of your wasted army from the continent, and collect every soldier within your reach, you will not still muster *one hundred thousand* men. Those who have more than a *million*, stung with revenge, flushed with conquest, and for whom their rulers *must* find an enemy to attack, such a force may not appear very formidable. Neither should I feel over-confident of our security, had we even Mr. *Young's five hundred thousand* men, *inrolled, armed, and officered,** although they were also in some degree trained; for unless our preparations for defence go to the full extent of our population, and to all the means which the *Saxon* principles of our constitution so admirably point out; that is, unless we oppose our invaders “*on principles as energetic as their own;*”† when we shall have manured the soil of *England* with our blood, we may not yet be able to transmit it to our posterity; but it may be parcelled out amongst our conquerors; and *England*, so long the glory of nations, may sink into a military colony of *France*.

I have not forgotten the British navy, nor am I ignorant of its value; but when my countrymen,

* *Annals of Agriculture*, No. 129, Page 301. † *Ib.* 289.

indulging

indulging prejudice and swayed by national vanity, tell me that it affords a safe protection from such a power as the French republic, encircling us with a coast from the Texel to Ushant, and from thence extending to the confines of *Spain*; my answer is, "Lay not this flattering unction to your soul."—Your navy, believe me, will have enough to do, to protect your foreign possessions, and your trade. How it has of late performed this last office, *Lloyd's* List but too plainly declares. A superior navy may, or *may not*, intercept an invading fleet. We have good Admirals; but they are not Gods, with power over the elements. A *Howe* has shewn us, that an English Admiral will do *with ships* what man can do; but before the French Commander *purposely* gave him battle, do we not all remember, that our great Admiral was the perpetual butt of satire, lampoon, epigram, calumny and insult, *because he did not bring the enemy to action*. Superior as proved the British fleet on the first of June, the French gave it battle, and gained their object. And when the conquest of this island shall be their object, are we to suppose they will scruple to secure a landing, although at the hazard of sacrificing half a score ships of the line! Those who shall put their trust in such wretched suppositions, and shall recal to our recollection the fate of the Armada, must carry with them, that *Philip* did not possess the whole south coast of the English Channel, nor
were

were his mariners acquainted with its navigation; and those who shall remind us of our victories off *Quiberon*, and *La Hogue*, will do well to recollect, that there was as wide a difference between the French Monarchy, and the French Republic, as between a *Louis* and a *Lycurgus*.

It was *Hannibal's* victory at *Cannæ*, shaking the very foundations of *Rome*, that determined her on carrying the war into the country of the Carthaginians. She carried it thither, and *Carthage* fell. But our *Hannibal* is not victorious; nor does *Paris* tremble at his name. Retreating from post to post, from river to river, the utmost we have to hope is, that he will not share the fate of a *Burgoyne* or a *Cornwallis*, and his army be lost to the defence of their country. To that country a navy is indeed a valuable auxiliary, for *balancing against other navies*, and for scouring the coasts; but from its own nature, and from the nature of the element on which it acts, it must of necessity be always separated and *detached* from the main force on which the security of the country properly depends; viz. ITS ARMED INHABITANTS.

If, therefore, we should neglect to arm, and the armies of our enemy should be poured in upon us from all the harbours extending from the *Texel* to *Oberburg*; while our grand fleet in an easterly wind should

should be cruising off *Brest*, to prevent another French army visiting *Ireland*; who is it that can answer for the safety of the country? A change of wind may then take place: a strong westerly wind may bring our fleet up channel, and drive it into the *Downs*.* By this time the French transports are returned in safety, and again loaded with a second embarkation of troops and ammunition. The western counties are now exposed; and the *Brest* army, instead of steering for *Ireland*, lands near *Plymouth*; while other bodies from all the ports between *Ushant* and *St. Maloes* direct their course to some important point in the neighbourhood of *Portsmouth*.—Attacked at so many points, who shall say the country might not be subdued, before the *unprepared* people could arm, and put themselves in a posture of defence!†

If such events as I have described are *possible*, even although *France* had no line-of-battle navy,

* Or it might be a manœuvre of *France* to carry the naval war into the *West Indies*, provided they previously secured a port, by a peace with *Spain*, or other means. In this case, our grand fleet must follow, and either our coasts or our commerce at home must be left undefended.

† From London, as a centre, to the coast of *Essex*, to *Margate*, to *Deal*, to *Dover*, to *Portsmouth*, or to any intermediate point in this circle of coast, the distance does not exceed *three days march of an army*.

how much more possible are they, when she has a fleet of large ships so considerable in number, that it is the employment of a very large part of the British navy to attend upon their motions. But if any part of the navies of *Spain* and *Holland* should speedily come into the hands of *France*, the balance of naval force might become more nearly equal, if not in favour of our enemy. And it ought to be remembered, that on the prosperity of *France*, in the present state of things, the loss of twenty, or even thirty ships of the line, could make no sensible impression; whereas such a disaster on our side would be dreadful indeed. Having neither foreign colonies, nor foreign commerce to protect, and in consequence of being an *armed nation*, absolutely invulnerable to any attack we can make upon her territory, to her a navy is not an arm of defence, but of offence. As neither her national, her colonial, nor her commercial existence depends upon it, so, for the accomplishment of any grand object, it may be her policy to hazard its defeat; knowing that it cannot be beaten without much damage being done to the victors, who can less afford to waste any of their naval strength. The news in *London*, of a glorious victory crowned with the capture of a dozen ships of the line brought in by our crippled fleet, might not cause much rejoicing, if accompanied with intelligence that a large army had made good its landing on our shore.

When

When in the beginning of October, the *warning* voice of Mr. *Young*, announced the absolute necessity of arming *five hundred thousand men*, even should circumstances turn out the most favourable he could possibly imagine; and that, in case our allies failed in their exertions, our situation would then demand “*double attention to the means of providing for the defence of this island,*” I presumed he spoke the language of ministers, and I gave them credit for seeing at length *in one particular* the interest of their country, and being prepared to pursue it; but now, that the dark side of Mr. *Young*’s alternative presents itself, and three months have already elapsed, the important business is suffered to sleep; and parliament itself has been but just assembled, although this serious alarm has been so long in circulation. Do ministers, then, if they can patch up a disgraceful peace, think of continuing the people disarmed, and unrepresented; and hope to persuade them they will be safe against a rival nation of more than double their numbers and completely armed; by having for their protectors a standing army, and a standing House of Commons, such as we have seen described by Mr. *Young*?* Is the British Constitution, is our existence as a people, to be thus hazarded to the last moment of criminal experiment, that the rotten-borough system, which holds both king and people in chains to the ruling faction of the day, may be preserved! But if the hope of

* See the Introduction.

peace amuse our ministers, what are the terms which a *defenceless* nation can obtain? To make a good peace, it is necessary to be in the best posture for war. With an ARMED NATION at his back, a minister might at least capitulate on honourable conditions; but if he treat when he can make no resistance, he must surrender at discretion. If therefore a capitulation be signed, before the garrison be armed, they will have more than reason to suspect, that they have been betrayed.

Thus, at a crisis like the present, when all *France* is ARMED, when she has *twelve hundred thousand victorious soldiers in the field*, and when *Britain* has nothing better to hope than to defend herself against the most gigantic power she ever encountered; at such a crisis, I say, whether it is to be war, or whether it is to be peace, the honour, the interest of *Britain* must be grossly sacrificed, if she be not instantly armed; that she may look her danger in the face without dismay, and take care that she be not sold in that market of corruption, where the interests of the borough-mongers have so long been preferred to the interests of the nation.

In truth, it is not any minister; it is not any negotiator; it is not any exercise of diplomatic skill; that can now obtain this nation a satisfactory peace. The nation itself *armed to a man*, and *represented in a free parliament*, is alone equal to the arduous task.

task. So cheap do I hold changes of ministry as a means to save a state, that even on the present occasion I should be ashamed to lay a stress upon it, did we not recollect the insufferable arrogance with which our ministers treated the ruling men in *France*, and how they vilified and insulted every one with whom we must now treat, if treaty be not altogether rejected. It were therefore the dictate not only of common prudence, but of common decency, that in speaking to *France* on the subject of reconciliation and peace, this nation should do it through other organs than the present.

But when, by means of reforming the House of Commons, arming the people, and changing our ministry, we may be raised to a proper level for treating with the high-minded republicans of *France*, a wide, a new, and difficult field of speculation presents itself. Restitutions we must make; and a little consideration will shew it to be our best interest so to do. At present, we have stripped *France* of her *Newfoundland* Fishery, her small settlements in *Hindustan*, and her *West India Islands*. We must not suppose she will consent to cease being a maritime power. Now a navy has but two supports: Commerce or War. If, therefore, we refused to restore any thing, she could not make Peace. It would ruin her navy. Are we, then, to have perpetual war, for the sake of retaining our conquests? I fear it would be paying too dear for them.

them. If by completely arming, by perpetual vigilance, and by meeting every attack with the spirit of Englishmen, we could defend our own island; how could we defend a commerce spread over the face of the whole world?

Has not recent experience shewn, that while *France* was making unparalleled exertions by land, she yet could find means to prey upon our Trade to a most alarming extent? What then must be the case, when, safe by land, similar exertions shall be directed towards her navy, and against the commerce of this country! such a war would be a nursery of seamen equal to her utmost wish. British capital would be employed to furnish a rich Lottery, stuck thick with prizes, for animating and rewarding the spirit of French adventure. Britons would plough and sow; Frenchmen would reap, In short, in such a war the commerce of Britain must be annihilated, unless all her shipping became ships of war as well as trade; and none put to sea but in fleets and with strong convoy. And what would that commerce be worth, carried on at such an enormous expence?*

D

In

* Is the astonishing indifference of our *London* merchants to the present situation of this country and its trade, a proof of that political knowledge, with the supposed possession of which they are so often complimented? I fear it is rather a strong and decisive fact, which must henceforth bring into utter contempt the political pretensions of the mercantile man; and mark him, in
confirmation

In every view of the present contest ending in a naval war between the two nations, it is big with ruin to this country; and has I trust so little charms in the eyes of the French government, that nothing but extremity will urge them to it. — I persuade myself they mean yet to be a civilized nation, and to cultivate the arts of peace. I am sure it is our interest not to counteract such inclinations. It were good policy methinks, if I may so express it, to take *France* into partnership on liberal terms; instead of driving her into hostility to the very existence of Trade. The world is wide enough for us both. Besides, being next neighbours, we ought especially to cultivate a mutual intercourse, as the nearest markets are generally the safest and the best.

The general interests of commerce are at this moment critically situated, and very much depend on the fate of *France*. By the late astonishing

confirmation of the sagacity of *Smith*, as the most dangerous being, that can be suffered to enter the closet of a minister. If these money-hunting gentlemen trust to the wings of their wealth for transporting them in prosperity and safety to other regions, while those whose property is in land must remain to abide the pitiless pelting of the approaching storm; even in *that* case, it seems to be time for looking to their retreat; or the unexpected lightnings of war may scorch their paper wings, and both their property and their persons may be overtaken by the coming hurricane.

combination

combination formed against her on one hand, and by the almost supernatural energy she has manifested on the other hand, her people are well-nigh driven into that singular state of society, adapted only to self-preservation and war, from which it is difficult to return into those paths of luxury, arts and refinements on which commerce depends; and fatal must it be to the commerce of *Europe*, if such return should be made wholly impracticable.

What has *France* even to fear from a perpetual war with all the maritime world? The adventurers of all countries would flock to her standard, and pirate under her flag. Her ships, not being worth fighting for, no private adventurers would cruize against her; and the trade of all nations would be her prey. It were possible to drive her against her natural habits and genius, into this horrible system, or else to an extremity more confined in its object, but perhaps more fatal to ourselves. For the sake, then, of humanity, and of all that adorns the civilized world, but especially for the sake of ourselves and our posterity, it is to be hoped that she will be induced, by our temper and moderation, to return into the paths of peace and commerce.

What are the precise restitutions to be made or conditions to be acceded to on our part, it may be presumption in an individual to think of pointing

out. But at such an epoch as the present, when the continental governments, like their own light and adulterated coin, seem as if they would not long be passible, but must one by one return to their national mints, to receive weight, purity and a new stamp; it may be of importance to suggest that negociators ought to elevate their minds and extend their ideas to higher and more enlarged systems of policy, than have hitherto occupied the attention of courts. In treating with the French, we ought, as far as human frailty can be shaken off, to get rid of the narrow-mindedness of rivals; and aim at an alliance and friendship, calculated to perpetuate liberty and peace to the two nations, and gradually to extend those blessings to all the nations around, by means only which the strictest moralist must approve. These two nations, distinguished for whatever benefits, adorns and dignifies human nature; the busy marts of the globe, the gay scenes of elegance and social happiness, the crowded theatres of instruction, the peaceful seats of industry, art, science, letters and liberty, will become as it were the Universities of Man, the attractive resorts of all nations; where the willing students, imbibing those delightful lessons, those stores of knowledge, those ennobling sentiments, and those grand views of the duties and the rights of men, with which, returning to enlighten their countrymen, the emancipation of mankind will make a rapid progress. If national
rivalship

rivalship must remain, hither be it directed. What a wide field is here, for the race of emulation! What a magnificent theatre, for the exercise of a bloodless ambition!

The world, I say, is wide enough for us both; and when our governments shall be so reformed, that WAR, which, although a poisoned apple of discord destroying nations, is the natural food of unrestrained monarchy and unbridled aristocracy, shall never be revived between us, until *the real interest of the people on either side require it*, (which is a case so far from probable, that it is scarcely possible) we may look forward with a pleasing confidence of durable peace, a total extinction of national debt, an immense reduction of taxes, an highly improved cultivation of our soil, a vast increase of population, and every other proof of prosperity.*

Arming the people, which is a fundamental of national freedom and security, at the same time that, at a trifling expence it would render us unconquerable; must free us from the greater part of that

* The mystery and iniquity of WAR, its real causes, and the true means of its prevention, may be seen luminously stated in the *Advice to the Privileged Orders*, by Joel Barlow, Esq. True—he is an American; he is a Republican; but if he will instruct me in peace, wisdom and virtue, I will be his disciple.

enormous expence at which we keep up a standing army. An alliance with *France*, in like manner, on a basis of friendship, sincerity and wisdom, might relieve us also from a large proportion of the cost, at which an immense navy is created, repaired and maintained. When I ask, 'why is our navy so large?' the answer must be, 'that it may not be inferior to those of rival powers.' But the principal of those powers may say to the reformed Legislature of *Britain*; 'Seeing that war is the consequence
' only of governments wherein an interest hostile to
' that of the people is predominant; and knowing
' that both you and ourselves have freed our re-
' spective systems from so monstrous a defect; why
' burthen our respective people any longer with
' navies, beyond what is necessary to teach the
' despotic states their duty to mankind?*' It were unnecessary to suggest the reply. Policy and the public good would admit but of one.

What a consolation to the human race, what an earnest of freedom to enslaved nations, must be such an union between *Great Britain* and *France*! Where is the mighty monarch that must not listen to their expostulations, or be awed by their me-

* "The possession of many sailors, as instruments of future wars, ought to be esteemed in the same light as great Russian or Prussian armies; that is to say, as the pests of human society."

Young's Travels, page 493.

naces ! Where is the oppressed people, that, suing to them, need despair of redress ! Ah ; deserted, abandoned, brave, but devoted Poles, wherefore are the only two nations on earth that could rescue you from the gripe of despots, wicked as fiends, hateful as hell, at strife and war with each other ! —and why, O Englishmen, are we in close alliance with the very powers whose armies are at this moment enslaving Poland ! A conduct so abhorrent to the genius of English freedom cannot be right. An inconsistency so glaring, no sophistry can reconcile.

But what says Mr. *Young* ? — “ The revolution
 “ that has taken place at *Geneva*, THE WAR
 “ IN POLAND, and the conspiracies in almost
 “ every part of *Europe*, all created and fomented
 “ by FRENCH GOLD and French agents,” &c.
 What ! no vitiated aliment, no foul humours, no internal obstructions and oppressions, in the body-politic of *Europe* ; which, like the elements of a long-forming gout in the human frame, are now beginning to work themselves off by violent and highly inflammatory paroxysms ! Can we discern no cause of commotions and war, but in *French gold* ? Have the *Poles* had no other cause for drawing the sword ! Where is Mr. *Young*’s proof of a French subsidy to *Kosciusko* ? and would it not have been glorious had they even marched an army

to his aid ?—I would to God that British armies and British gold had not been worse employed !

How changed are Mr. *Young's* sentiments, since he penned the following lines ! “ Oil and vinegar
 “ —fire and water—Prussians and Austrians are
 “ united to carry war against twenty-six millions
 “ of men, arranged behind an hundred of the
 “ strongest fortresses in the world.—If we are de-
 “ ceived, and Frenchmen are not fond of freedom,
 “ but will fight for despotism—something may be
 “ done ; for then *France* falls by the power of
 “ *France* : but if united but tolerably, the attack
 “ will be full of difficulty in a country where
 “ every man, woman, and child is an enemy, that
 “ fights for freedom. But suppose this idea erro-
 “ neous—suppose an impression made—and that
 “ the German banners were flying at *Paris*.—
 “ Where is the security of the rest of *Europe* ?
 “ Is THE DIVISION OF POLAND FORGOTTEN ? Is
 “ an unforeseen union of two or three great powers
 “ to protrude through *Europe* a predominancy dan-
 “ gerous to all ? Gentlemen who indulge their
 “ wishes for a counter-revolution in *France*, do
 “ not, perhaps, wish to see the Prussian colours at
 “ the Tower, nor the Austrian at Amsterdam.
 “ Yet success to the cause might plant them there.
 “ Should real danger arise to *France*, which I hold
 “ to be problematical, it is the business and direct
 “ interest

“ interest of her neighbours, to support her.”* Such were the sentiments of Mr. *Young* but four months before he published the first part of his *Example of France, a Warning to Britain!*—“ *Is the division of Poland forgotten?*”! Perhaps it is, as I find it has been *forgotten* to insert the whole of this passage in the author’s second edition.

But to turn once more towards the angel peace, and to reflect on the conditions on which she may be rendered a perpetual guest, to cheer and bless our happy island; perhaps it were now the critical season for well considering a system of policy in which this country is deeply concerned, and on which there is even amongst well-informed men, a considerable difference of opinion. I allude to the system of colonies and distant dominions. Few have denied the wisdom of our originally founding colonies in *America*, or fortified factories in the east; but many there are who think, that colonizing and conquering abroad, have had too much of our attention, and may be carried to a fatal extreme. Universal empire is the very phrenzy of ambition. When you have discovered the limit, beyond which the bounded faculties of man cannot govern but with oppression, you have discovered the boundaries of a just dominion.

* *Young’s Travels*, page 566.

Populous nations may possibly be so circumstanced, that, to govern, may be to protect them from savage tyrants: but this implies extraordinary defects in the intellectual, moral and political improvement of such nations; which defects it is the duty of their lords to remove; nor do such defects in any wise release them from the obligations, which lie upon all rulers, to govern with justice. In the administration of distant provinces, men may be rewarded for quitting their native country in the prime of life, and for encountering unhealthy climates, in the public service; but in providing for, and proportioning, such rewards, beware not to alienate the minds of the governed. Take care, in particular, not to render them a prey to rapacity, the victims of imbecility, or the sport of insolent tyranny. Let them not, from observing the lawlessness, the odiousness, or the contemptibleness of the men sent amongst them, be able to ascribe to the presiding government that sent them, such an ascendancy of faction and corruption, as to produce a system of dirty private patronage, instead of an enlarged superintending policy, built on impartial law and official integrity.

How essential then to a just, a prudent, a conciliating system of colonial and provincial government, is independency and purity in the legislature

at

at home ! Distant dominions fleeced and insulted must ever be insecure. If warlike, they will copy *America* ; if pusillanimous, they will intrigue with your enemies. A government of injustice, is a constitution with poison in every vein, disease in every fibre. The more distant such a dominion, the more difficult to hold ; and the greater the magnitude of the whole empire, the more certain is misgovernment to bring it to ruin. While *Britain* has cause to know that she is in immediate danger ; while her every exertion is requisite for self-preservation ; while all her native energies and activity will be little enough to defend her own existence ; how can she with *an unreformed House of Commons* and an *unarmed people*, bear on her shoulders the pressure of her feeble dominions in *North America*, her insecure islands in the *West Indies*, and her wide-extended provinces in *Hindostan* !

It is time she sought to know, in what the natural, solid, well-wearing strength of a nation depends. It is time she thought of employing more capital on the cultivation of her native soil, and less on that of distant countries. And it is time that she thought of seeking republican energy in the full recovery of her constitution. The rotten-borough cancer in her breasts taints, relaxes, and debilitates her whole frame. It corrupts every department, every branch, every
ramification

ramification of the state. It utterly extirpates all principle, to make way for universal venality: it repels from office real patriotism; it renders even zeal in the public servants, a feeling against nature; and, besides proving, in the first instance, a most exhausting drain of that blood of the political body, money, it effectually undermines all wholesome discipline civil, military, and judicial, at home and abroad. Borough interest, or parliamentary influence, is an almost universal qualification for office; a substitute for all the human virtues; and a letter of impunity to the greatest crimes.—To suppose that in the present awful contest, such an enfeebled, sickly government will enable this country to contend with republican *France*; exhibiting the intellect of *Athens*, the discipline of *Rome*, and the military enthusiasm of *Sparta*; would be no wiser than to suppose that a company of the filken sons of sloth and debauchery, would come off victors over double their numbers of the hardy sons of temperance and active labour, at such gymnastic exercises as wrestling, boxing, or throwing the sledge.

To restore the constitution at home, is the only mean by which the attachment and fidelity of your dependencies can be secured: and on that attachment and fidelity depends your ability to concentrate the force of the empire for the defence of the seat of empire. It was by the radical defect in

our

our government,—it was to feed the insatiable maw of that monster CORRUPTION,—it was to preserve an infamous system of factious patronage, bowing our necks to the yoke of a few insolent usurpers,—it was to gratify the Borough-mongers and their creatures to the fiftieth link of connection and dependence, that we violated a fundamental principle of the constitution, which brought on a most calamitous war, that rent from our dominion the most prosperous and affectionate colonies that ever rendered an empire great and illustrious.

Discontented provinces at a distance which, instead of being animated to union and vigour for self defence, require to be kept in subjection by your troops, are, at such a period as the present, sources of weakness instead of causes of strength; and in exact proportion to their discontents. But how can those discontents be removed, unless you remove the cause! You cannot shield them from oppression, while their oppressors lord it at home over *Britain* herself. While *India* patronage is upheld by, and at the same time upholds, the rotten-borough system, *India* must be fleeced by the hand of rapacity, and insulted by the unfitness of men for the offices to which they are appointed. And while that system remains, there must be so great a disparity between liberty in the *United States*
of

of *America*, and liberty in the remaining British provinces on that continent, as to nourish discontents that must end in another dismemberment:—and when is such an event so likely to happen as at the very moment when the war shall be at the gates of *London*.

In the hour of your distress, instead of receiving succours from your distant provinces; or even the consolation of knowing that their fidelity remains unshaken; you may expect to hear that your distress was the signal for their revolt, and that the monopoly of their trade is for ever gone from you. Good God! and are there men in this country such enemies to its every interest,—to its very preservation,—to its security from becoming itself a province, a dependency on the proud republic of *France*; as, at a moment of such accumulated peril as the present, not to come forward with a voluntary surrender of their boroughs, and heartily to concur in rendering the Commons House of Parliament a genuine representation of the people! —Can they obstinately persist in being the cause of national disunion; of spunging to themselves the heart's blood of the state;—of expelling from our government every principle of energy; and of loosening the bands of union between *Great Britain* and her provinces; if not of converting those provinces rather into a burthen than a benefit!

Are

Are they prepared for the consequences of such a conduct to their country? Are they prepared to brave the public odium in such a cause? Are they fortified against the detestation and contempt of all mankind? Whenever, and wherever, they shall appear in our streets, what will be their feelings, when they shall see themselves continually pointed at by the finger of scorn! And, in truth, I believe the moment is fast advancing, when we shall endure the sight of a spy, an informer, a perjured witness, or the vilest apostate, with more composure than that of a Borough-monger. Three years ago, that appellation was merely synonymous with *Political Swindler*; but now—thanks to *Robertspiere*—it means much more. The Borough-monger's trade is national pillage and depredation; and his means, fraud, menace, or murder, as his occasions require.

There are writers of eminence, who are against the holding of any colonies or transmarine dominions at all, as injurious to the interest of the presiding country. Mr. *Young* is of this number. According to him, “ It would be right for every
 “ country to open her colonies to all the world, on
 “ principles of liberality and freedom; and still it
 “ would be better to go one step farther, and have
 “ no colonies at all. The sugar islands of all na-
 “ tions, in the *West Indies*, including the great
 “ island

“ island of *Cuba*, are considerable enough to form
 “ an independent free nation; and it wants not
 “ many arguments to shew, that the existence of
 “ such an one would be far more beneficial to the
 “ English, French and Spaniards, than the possession
 “ of those islands as colonies.”*

After much able reasoning in support of his doctrine, he proceeds; “ I have used,” says he,
 “ no arguments against the French sugar islands
 “ that are not applicable likewise to the English;
 “ I hold them to be equal obstacles to the prosperity
 “ of both kingdoms; and, as far as the
 “ experiment of the loss of *North America* goes, I
 “ am justified by that vast and important fact—
 “ that a country may lose the monopoly of a distant
 “ empire, and rise from the imaginary loss
 “ more rich, more powerful, and more prosperous!
 “ If these principles be just, and that they
 “ are so is confirmed by an immense range of facts,
 “ what are we to think of a politician who declares,
 “ that the loss of *Bengal*, or the Dutch
 “ withdrawing their money from our funds, would
 “ ruin England.”†

And again: after relating a conversation on the same subject with Abbé *Raynal* at *Bourdeaux*, he

* *Young's Travels*, Page 492. † *Ibid.* 495.

proceeds—"When will the obvious conclusions,
 "to be drawn from that prodigious* event,* be
 "adopted? that all transmarine, or distant do-
 "minions, *are sources of weakness*, and that *to re-*
 "*nounce them would be wisdom*. Apply this in
 "*France*, to *St. Domingo*; in Spain, to Peru; or
 "in *England* to *Bengal*, and mark the ideas and
 "replies that are excited. I have no doubt, how-
 "ever, of the fact.†"

As this doctrine is said to have made of late great progress in *France*, it might not be altogether surprising if, on treating with her for peace, (whenever that time shall come) she should propose as a condition, that neither nation should in future hold any *West-India* island. If, then, the government and the parliament of *England* should not be ready to subscribe to the doctrine of Mr. *Young*, and if such a proposal from *France*, and its practical consequences, would merit to be thoroughly weighed and considered before they were adopted; we have additional arguments for putting ourselves in a posture of the utmost strength, before we enter on any treaty for peace. But, indeed, there is no point of view, in which the situation of this country can be seen, that does not im-

* The American Revolution.

† Young's Travels, p. 180.

press upon the intelligent mind, the wisdom of completely arming the people.

The supposition of relinquishing all our *West-India* islands, seems to imply in it, not only a mutual guarantee of the two nations to the independence of those islands; but that all the isles of all other nations should be included in the system, and taken under the same protection. If this were acceded to, there would then be wanting *Ports* to the navies of *England* and *France*; with stores and necessaries; officers and artificers; for repairs, supplies and equipments; or how is the guarantee to be maintained? And farther;—in the islands where the Negroes are not yet emancipated, how are the whites to be protected from the blacks, until the latter, by a gradual conversion to free men, thro' instruction, indulgence, kindness and encouragement, shall no longer be dangerous to the existence of the former? And then; for the support of such a system; for the means of this protection; and for the maintenance of this guarantee; a general tax must be levied on all the islands in favour of *England* and *France*. How is this tax to be raised, without an adequate power being for that purpose, vested in the two guarantees? And how will the other nations be convinced, that by acceding to the relinquishment of their islands, they
have

have not in fact surrendered them into the hands of the two guaranteeing powers?

But notwithstanding these difficulties and causes for hesitation, and even admitting that the whole *West-India* trade would be open and free to all, which, on Mr. *Young's* principles, would be favourable to that nation which had most capital and most credit; yet how far the *United States of America*, with the great advantages they possess in the *Lumber* trade, and in consequence of their vicinity, might be able gradually and necessarily to exclude you from the carrying trade, as fast as their trading capital increased, and they could increase the number of their ships, (an object to the attainment of which they want nothing that nature or art have to give); is another very important consideration.

At all events, now that a relinquishment of colonies, and a free trade all over the world, are ideas afloat in French minds, we ought to stand on ground of great solidity, and be in the full possession and exercise of our natural strength, ere we venture into a treaty in which propositions of such a nature are likely to come forward, and to be supported with ardour. And if a proposal for renouncing the *West-India* islands, is to be followed by one, for abandoning our remaining provinces in *North America*; and another, for evacuating

our immense possessions in *India*; still more and more is it necessary, that we put ourselves in a situation to send our ambassadors to meet those of *France* at the *Hague*; rather than expose ourselves to the possibility of being compelled to treat through *Picbegrü*, encamped on *Blackbeath*, or quartered in the city and suburbs of *London*.

Nothing that I have advanced amounts to a denial that Mr. *Young* is right in his principle, that “*all transmarine or distant dominions are sources of weakness*,” but it must be allowed, that the question is too important to be lightly decided; and that, in case he be in an error, we ought not to hazard our being driven by *compulsion* to adopt it in practice. I am inclined to think that a perfectly free trade all over the world is extremely desirable, and would prove most beneficial to that nation which should be superior to all others in capital and in shipping: as may be inferred from our trade with *China*, where, although we have no dominion, we almost monopolize the traffick with that country. And who can doubt that universal *peace*, *hospitality*, and *social intercourse*, between all nations, are greatly to be desired; but at the same time, who, in various parts of the world, would venture to *act*, as if such a principle were universally established?

It is likewise to be feared, that, in respect to commerce, we are at a great distance from any thing so perfect; and can only approximate towards it progressively and slowly. At all events, so long as we hope to derive prosperity from colonies and provinces, we must be guilty of extreme folly in not holding them by their own interest and affection, founded on our sacred regard to justice. It was by the most stupid and wanton violation of this principle, we lost *America*.

So early as in the spring of the year 1775, ere an hostile stroke had been struck beyond the *Atlantic*, the writer of this essay tendered to his country the following advice: To declare the colonies independent of parliament, and united with *Britain* only by the link of one common crown; and to form with them a foederal league, under which the mother country should be the umpire of all the differences between her colonial children, the common guarantee of the independence of each separately, and the naval protector of the territory and trade of all: and in consideration of these services, either to receive a specific annual payment, or such a degree of commercial monopoly, as Congress should think adequate thereto.*

* See *American Independence the Interest and Glory of Great Britain*.

Had this advice been at that time taken, his Majesty and his heirs might have been kings of that vast continent for ages to come; neither the prosperity of the *United States*, nor the commerce of *Britain*, had received a temporary check; and this foolish country had been richer than she is, by a sum more than equal to her debt, at the commencement of the present war, enormous as that debt then was, viz. nearly 248 millions.* The actual debt incurred by the American war was about 121 millions; to which add the depression of rents, the depreciation in the value of landed produce, as well as all the disasters, captures and bankruptcies, during a seven years contest, as actual *loss*: Then again take into the account the failure of that profit which must have accrued, had there been no interruption of peace and harmony: When the whole is brought together, it cannot make an aggregate of *loss* less than 250 millions; without even reckoning three millions, for at least one hundred thousand men's lives, at thirty pounds a life, according to the market prices in *Hesse* and *Hanover*.

And is a nation to pay at such a rate, every time that a minister makes a political mistake; or has the abandoned wickedness to rush into war, intentionally to violate the constitution, or the

* See *Sinclair* on the Revenue.

Rights of Man!—*But a nation that suffers the representation of its millions to be in effect annihilated, in favour of fewer persons than a minister can at once set down to his dining-table, must expect to have frequent occasions to make such melancholy reflections!*

At the commencement of the present war, no less than at the commencement of that with our colonies, this happy nation was at peace with every other; no power on earth had the means to do her hurt; her commerce collected for her citizens a revenue from a tributary world; her cup of prosperity was full, and overflowing. See, then, what a dreadful scourge is that fiend called *a minister*, when he is the tool of a powerful faction, and when a people has no representative to controul his actions! By the wickedness of a *North*, in a few years our country was humbled, degraded, and brought to drink deep of adversity; but by the more detestable wickedness of a *Pitt*, in less than a third part of the same time, she is brought into a situation, in which nothing short of every latent energy, every particle of native strength, being brought into action, can preserve her existence.

The advice, therefore, now offered to my country, is too late to operate as that given in the case of *America* might have done. It cannot prevent the

enormous expence that is past, of blood and of treasure; it cannot restore the seventy millions already added to the public debt.* But, if timely adopted, it may prevent the extremity of evil, to which the iniquity of the minister is hurrying this devoted land: it may prevent a compulsive abandonment of *Canada* and *Nova Scotia*; it may prevent a forced relinquishment of our whole *East Indies*; it may prevent *Bengal*, *Babar* and *Orissa* (a territory as extensive and populous as *France*) being torn from our dominion by an unforeseen, abrupt, and destructive revolution; and it may prevent an open and free trade prematurely taking place, when we shall have little other capital left, for embarking in it, than what our soil and our industry shall leave, after furnishing us with the humble necessaries of existence: in short, it may prevent *Britain* from being brought into the situation of a rich man, with all his treasure in his house, awakened from sleep, and the dreams of security, by a murderous knife at his throat, and compelled to cry out—spare my life and take all I have.

An open and free trade has doubtless its recommendations; and there are reasons against distant transmarine dominions. By wholly withdrawing

* See Walker's Review of Political Events in Manchester, p. 160.

dominion, instead of exercising it with wisdom and benevolence, we doubtless should cut off the temptation of becoming tyrants, and prevent the evils flowing from that source; and commerce, if there were nothing to obstruct it, might doubtless be more profitably carried on, without, in the first instance, embarking at great hazard capital in the cultivation of distant soils to the neglect of our own; and, in the next place, adding to the expence of the outfit, the vast charge of fleets and armies, with the additional burthen of civil establishments, and all the grandeur of government.

But if this system of an open and free trade all over the world is to be adopted, let it be an object of independent treaty and free choice; not the dictate of compulsion and despair. In the former case we should come in for our full share; and a share much larger than any other nation; because of our superior capital and credit; the variety and excellence of our manufactures: in the latter, I fear its introduction would be our utter ruin. Supposing the system voluntary and optional, and that in the *West Indies* our superiority of capital* should

* We could not enter into the Lumber Trade from the North without the permission of the *United States*; but the system of an open trade implies not only their concurrence, but that of all other states. In which case, it seems to follow, that we might employ our shipping in the carrying trade between the *United States* and the *West Indies*.

countervail the vicinity and other natural advantages of the *United States*; and suppose again, that when our *power* was withdrawn from *India*,* we found the effeminate people under no worse government than our own, and none to interrupt the perfect freedom of commerce; while our shipping could be sure of every accommodation for repairs and refitments; then, indeed, I know not but it might be our interest if the system were established. We might be less exposed to war and to debt; and the unshackled energies of national commerce would, I doubt not, work the wonders of republican freedom and enterprize. Provided we strengthen ourselves in time, it will be in our power to say to *France*, whether such a system shall, or shall not, be adopted between us. If we delay the means of security too long, it may become prudent, for fear of more fatal consequences, to acquiesce against our will: but if we suffer *France* to serve us, as she is serving *Holland*, our country, our commerce, and our colonies must all lie at her mercy.

* Supposing we could treat upon the ground of such a renunciation, the situation of our Asiatic provinces, and the circumstances of our connection, would seem to require a period of at least twenty years, for giving up our pretensions without vast loss to the India Company, and for placing the natives in a situation in which they could preserve their independence. They must be provided with free constitutions; and, by the practical exercise of the rights of free men for some years, be taught how to preserve them against enemies both within and without.

A free trade, while it laid open our colonies to others, would afford us some advantages. No part of the *West Indies* reverting to *France*, the whole of the islands would invite our commerce. All the ports of *Mexico* and of *South America*, to which our present access is by the circuitous and less profitable route of *Cadiz* and *Lisbon*, would be open to our manufactures; and we might visit the *Spice Islands*, *Batavia*, and all the other monopolized settlements in *Asia* and *Africa* without restraint. The commerce of the world thus laid open, those who have most capital, most character, most skill and activity, will of course have the preference in all markets, and carry off as much of the trade as they can occupy. In these grand essentials *Britain* certainly has no rival. And when we contemplate the infinite demands of civilized *Europe* and *Asia*; the astonishingly increasing wants of the *North American States*; and likewise the supplies required by the immense regions in *Asia*, and *Africa*, and *America*, where civilization and commerce are only in their infancy; how were it possible that *Britain* could want markets for her commodities, or employment for her growing capital.

And another very important advantage would be much accelerated by a relinquishment of all foreign dominion. In cultivation, Britain to the tops of her mountains would become a garden; in population,

tion, a hive. Superiority in commerce, must furnish the proportional means of superiority in naval power, whenever we might have occasion to call it forth. An armed nation, and the republican energies of free government, would give us perfect security at home.

With peace and an open trade, I do not see how *France* could possibly keep peace with us. It is a race in which, if we do not by our folly throw away our advantages, she must be distanced. After the revolution of centuries, each having started with their present means, she must still be far in the rear. As a commercial rival, she is an actual bankrupt, and the very basis of her manufactures, the very tools of her trade are nearly annihilated; while an empty purse denies her any other means of recovery than the utmost frugality and the most laborious industry: while we, on the contrary, have manufacturers of every kind in activity; stocks, and capital, and credit almost boundless; and the commerce of the world in our possession. They are, however, superior, in having more arms and armed men, and a government of more energy. May we not be so besotted, as to suffer these, their only advantages, to deprive us in a moment of all that we possess!

I have touched on the subject of an open trade, that in case the desperation of the minister, and the
tameness

tamenefs of the public, ſhould bring us into ſuch an extremity, that we could not with prudence or ſafety, reſuſe even ſuch a trade to the demand of *France*, we may not give up all for loſt. In my mind, it would be far better to accede to even that demand, than, diſarmed as the nation now is, and deprived of an energetic government, by the reaſonable uſurpation of our Borough-mongers, to expoſe ourſelves to the hazards incident to the continuance of this deteſtable and moſt deſtructive war. The day ſeems rapidly approaching which muſt decide our fate; and four diſtinct events ſeem to hang in the ſcales. 1ſt, An honourable peace, with ſecurity for the future; but no indemnity for the paſt: 2d, An end of colonial monopoly, and an open trade throughout the world: 3d, A perpetual naval war, with an enemy invulnerable to our attacks, and without any trade on which we can retaliate: Or 4th, a national and univerſal bankruptcy, and *Britain* at the feet of *France*.

But the ſpeech and the addreſs are ſilent on *arming* and *reforming*, and breathe nothing but proſecuting a war of extermination.

Whether any of the allies can be rallied once more in the cruſade againſt *France*, or not, the game played by *Great Britain* is full of peril in the extreme. Another offensive campaign, with half
the

the Russian army landed in *France*, will, in the judgments of many, be thought far less likely to restore monarchy in that country, than ultimately to abolish it in this, as well as to drive the Republic such lengths in the Spartan system, as to confirm her in it beyond the power of a retreat. In that case all foreign trade would be inconsistent with the genius of her government; but it would be her policy to make eternal war upon the trade of *Great Britain*; and continually to harass her coasts with predatory expeditions or serious invasion. Should the fierce *Suwarrow* lead his Russians along the banks of the *Seine*, it would not be surprising if none opposed his march, but that armies of observation should hover on his flanks, until sure of their prey. And while we were dreaming of his entering *Paris*, it might be well if that very moment should not be chosen for *Pichegru's* marching to *London*. Such an attempt, whether successful or not, would produce melancholy countenances and aching hearts in this scene of gaiety, bustle, and dissipation. A double security would then be felt to be wanting. Those who remembered the year 1780, and who might think there were not wanting in *London* emissaries of the enemy, and still more-dreaded incendiaries, would not repose on their pillows with much tranquillity, although forces were mustered to meet the invaders in the field; unless a compleat interior defence

defence also remained, for the security of this great commercial city; the bank, the funds, the merchandize, the shipping, and the dwellings of its millions.

Take, then, the unfavourable side of the question, and admit but the possibility of the fortune of war putting the enemy in possession of *London*; can we be sure they would not instantly give it to the flames?—They who strike at the heart, mean destruction. Destruction, indeed, would too probably follow their victorious entry into our capital. The funds would vanish, and, like the baseless fabric of a vision, leave not a rack behind. And who could describe the wide-wasting ruin of their annihilation! the calamity it would bring on thousands, and tens of thousands! the endless chain of bankruptcies that must follow; the poverty, the confusion, the agony and wild despair of such a period! What would it avail that a week before, we had had dominion in every quarter of the globe, and could have numbered twenty millions of subjects in the provinces of our empire! Here in a moment would be an end of all—our Babylon fallen—our Empire given to another!

Can the government, seeing the possibility of such an event, delay one moment a call to arms! Can it see the tide of conquest overwhelming nations,

tions, swallowing up our allies, and rolling towards our shores, and neglect to remind the people of their duty ! When it suited ministers *for the object explained by Mr. Young**, (207) to hurry the people headlong into this dreadful war, both their inclination and their every interest forbidding the folly, then indeed no man was to be left untterrified into the mad measures of the cabinet ; insidious proclamations were to be sent forth, to spread delusion ; associations and committees of alarm were to circulate their poisonous falsehoods ; and the most infamous calumnies on all who resisted the torrent, were to be propagated at any expence. How busily at that time ministers and their echoes pictured forth the imminent dangers of the capital from plots, conspiracies, assassinations, and treasons, we all remember.

Then, forsooth, no man could sleep in his bed, for the terror of expecting it to be wrapped in flames ere day-light returned ! and when, again the cause of *Parliamentary Reform*, notwithstanding the insinuations and menaces against its promoters, still gained ground, new alarms were to be propagated, and the dread of immediate invasion and plotted insurrection were to be impressed upon us, the fraudulent trick was played off, and the Borough-mongers were provided with their chosen bands.

* See the Introduction.

And the very men who were most active to counteract the real conspiracies and treasons against the constitution—the *conspiracies and treasons of those very Borough-mongers*—were then to be generally stigmatized as disaffected persons; and to be apprehended as being themselves enemies to that state they were labouring to save. But now, that not the Rotten Boroughs only, but the country itself is in the most imminent danger; ministers can slumber over their preparations for defence for more than three months after their Herald has proclaimed the necessity of *five hundred thousand* Englishmen arming for self-defence, and of all *Europe* combining more closely than ever to resist the gigantic force of *France*! At such a moment it is, that ministers with much indifference can see us a *disarmed, defenceless, unprepared people*, scarcely more capable of resisting a torrent of French invaders, than the herds and the flocks of *Smithfield*!

But if ministers thus criminally neglect their duty, is this once martial nation, are Englishmen to hold their necks ready for the slaughter, or for the yoke of a foreign power! Have we no ancient laws, prior to the policy of standing armies, and at this day unrepealed, by which we are secured from such wretchedness; and taught and required to stand forth in legal military array, in our country's defence?*

* See the Appendix, No. 1 and 2.

fred in less esteem with our Rulers, than that policy which has lost to the Emperor Brabant and Flanders, and driven the Stadtholder from Holland.

If I judge rightly from the awakening quality of some late proceedings; from those resistless rays of truth which are even now piercing and dispersing the mists of delusion; and from the generous feeling which begins once more to tingle in English bosoms; the late portentous, dreadful torpor of the public mind, the deep insensibility to a public interest, the almost utter incapacity of even *thinking*, but as ministers and their parasites were pleased to prescribe, are fast departing from this once glorious isle; to make way for that love of country, that independency of spirit, that manly sense, and that well-directed courage, which know how to deal either with internal corruption, or foreign force.

As an individual I have done my duty: I have exposed ministerial delusions:* I have endeavoured to dispel national infatuation: and I have provided myself with arms, to stand or fall with the liberties of my country.† From all present appearances,
I expect

* See the Postscript to my Letter to the Duke of Newcastle, containing Strictures on the Proclamation of the 21st of May, 1792. Also a Letter on the same subject, in the Newark Herald, 1792, given in the Appendix; and my

Letter to a Friend at Boston, dated Jan. 28, 1793.

† When the insidious plan for arming the body-guards of the Borough-mongers was in its progress, I proposed its rejection in
the

I expect that through procrastination, and the traiterous policy of keeping the people disarmed till the last moment, the defence of those liberties, if under such circumstances they can be defended, will cost much English blood, and on English land. It is a crisis, however, that, when it comes, so far as my conscience is concerned, I can look on with composure. I have no head that will be forfeited, for plunging my country into unparalleled calamity in a very suspicious cause; nor a

the district where I live, and moved in its stead the following Propositions; of which my copy being in the country, I can now only give the sense. 1. That we should publish an invitation to every taxed householder to provide a musquet, with its appendages and ammunition. 2. That we should appoint a Committee, to examine the common and statute law of the land, as well as the best legal authorities; to learn how such a constitutional arming of the inhabitants might be rendered most effective towards the preservation of the peace, and the defence of the country. 3. That the magistrates acting in that district, with other competent persons, should form such Committee.

No one seconding these motions, they fell to the ground; and the minister's plan, on the very face of which it appeared, that the persons then to be armed were at the return of peace to be *disarmed* again, was adopted. The design and effect of such Court systems, our good unsuspicious Associators against Republicans and Levellers do not seem to penetrate. But their oracle, the author of *The Example of France a Warning to Britain* will inform them, that "When we see, as in all the monarchies of Europe, the government only armed, DESPOTISM
" IS ESTABLISHED." See *Young's Travels*. p. 550.

heart that will reproach me for not having watched over her dearest interests, and anxiously studied her preservation. The same straight line of conduct that I have ever held will be then before me. I hope not to survive my country's liberties. Unless detained by prison bolts, I will not live in a land of slaves.

I have spoken of *conspiracy*, and of *treason* committed by the Borough-mongers. I say again, CONSPIRACY;—I say again, TREASON. But in saying this, I acknowledge my language to be *figurative*; and only expressive of that which, although no treason by law, is an act more immoral and atrocious than legal treason itself; as more conducing to that destruction of the state, which it is the object of the statute against treason to punish. The crime, I say, is against the *state*, the *constitution*; and “the statute of Edward III. “by which we are governed, hath not declared “this to be high treason;” because such an attack is not “a *specific* treason to compass and imagine “the *death* of the king.”* Why the *part* should have attracted so much more attention than the *whole*, is for history to unfold:—Why it should be a greater crime to kill the prince upon the throne, which is not a killing of the *king*;—for our law says the *king* cannot die;—than to take away the

* Lord Chief Justice's Charge to the Grand Jury of Middlesex, Oct. 2, 1794.

very foundations of the throne and kingly office, and to stab to the vitals the constitution itself, remains yet to be explained. Lord Chancellor *Somers* says, "Treason is a betraying of the *state*; and THE
 " FIRST AND HIGHEST TREASON IS THAT WHICH
 " IS COMMITTED AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION."

And herein we have now another great law authority; I mean that of Lord Chief Justice *Eyre*, in the Charge just quoted. After speaking of "a conspiracy to depose or to imprison the king, to
 " get his person into the power of the conspirators," &c. he proceeds thus; "need I add, that if it
 " should appear that it has entered into the heart of
 " any man, who is a subject of this country, to de-
 " sign to overthrow the whole government of the
 " country, to pull down and to subvert from its very
 " foundations the British Monarchy, that glorious
 " fabric which it has been the work of ages to erect,
 " maintain, and support, which has been cemented
 " with the best blood of our ancestors; to design such
 " a horrible ruin and devastation, which no king
 " could survive, a crime of such a magnitude that no
 " lawgiver in this country hath ever ventured to
 " contemplate it in its whole extent;* need I add,
 " I say, that the complication and the enormous
 " extent of such a design will not prevent its being

* The passage here given in Italics, in the original is distinguished by Roman capitals.

“ distinctly seen ; that *the compassing and imagining*
“ *the death of the king is involved in it, is in truth*
“ *of its very essence.*

“ This is too plain a case to require further il-
“ lustration from me. If any man of plain sense,
“ but not conversant with subjects of this nature,
“ should feel himself disposed to ask whether a
“ conspiracy of this nature is to be reached by this
“ medium only ; whether it is a *specific* treason to
“ compass and imagine the death of the king, and
“ *not a specific* treason to conspire to subvert the
“ monarchy itself ; I answer that the statute of
“ Edward III. by which we are governed, hath
“ not declared this (WHICH IN ALL JUST THEORY
“ OF TREASON IS THE GREATEST OF ALL TREAS-
“ ons) to be High Treason.”

Let us, then, inquire, how a proof of what I
impute to the Borough-mongers is to be brought
home to them. I know but of *one* tribunal,
which is permitted to receive such proofs ; and as
that tribunal will not suffer an appeal from its de-
cisions, it should seem to be its indispensable duty,
to inquire into every serious charge brought before
it. I speak of the House of Commons, *to whom*,
as a tribunal for inquiring into all conspiracies and
treasonable practices against the state and the con-
stitution to be proved by *overt acts*, which subvert
the

the rights of election in the people, and consequently subvert the freedom and independency of the House itself, all *indictments*, in the form of *petitions*, must be preferred. A stronger *indictment* of this kind, against the whole gang of Borough-mongers, I cannot easily conceive, than that which, in the form of a *petition*, was presented to that Tribunal on the 6th day of May 1793, by some of the members of a society to which I have the honour to belong. Of *seventy-six* counts, or paragraphs, I shall refer to no more than six.—Therein the attention of the *Tribunal* is called “to the greatest evil produced by the defects in the representation of which they complain; namely, the extent of PRIVATE PARLIAMENTARY PATRONAGE; an abuse which obviously tends to exclude the great mass of the people from any substantial influence in the election of the House of Commons, and which, in its progress, *threatens* to usurp the sovereignty of the country, to the equal danger of the King, of the Lords, and of the Commons.*

“By these means, a weight of Parliamentary influence has been obtained by certain individuals, forbidden by the spirit of the laws, and in its consequences most dangerous to the liberties of the People of Great Britain.

* If the petitioners had used stronger terms, I see not how they could have exceeded the truth.

“The

“ The operation of the first species of patronage
 “ is direct, and subject to positive proof. EIGHTY-
 “ FOUR individuals do by their own immediate au-
 “ thority send ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN of
 “ your Honourable Members to Parliament. And
 “ this your Petitioners are ready, if the fact be dis-
 “ puted, to prove, and to name the members and
 “ the patrons.

“ The second species of patronage cannot be
 “ shewn with equal accuracy, though it is felt with
 “ equal force.

“ Your Petitioners are convinced, that in ad-
 “ dition to the 157 Honourable Members above-
 “ mentioned, 150 more, making in the whole
 “ THREE HUNDRED AND SEVEN, are returned to
 “ your Honourable House, not by the collective
 “ voice of those whom they appear to represent,
 “ but by the recommendation of 70 powerful in-
 “ dividuals, added to the 84 above-mentioned,
 “ and making the total number of patrons altoge-
 “ ther only 154, who return a DECIDED
 “ MAJORITY of your Honourable House.*

“ Your

* This account makes 154 return 307 ; whereas Mr. *Holcroft* from the same authority makes 162 return 309. The difference arises from my quoting the words of the petition, and his quoting a Table given in the state of the Representation. The truth is, the Petitioners saw reason, in framing their *Indictment* of the
 Borough-

“ Your Petitioners inform your Honourable
 “ House, and are ready to prove it at your Bar,
 “ that they have the most reasonable grounds to
 “ suspect that no less than ONE HUNDRED AND
 “ FIFTY of your Honourable Members owe their
 “ elections entirely to the interference of PEERS;
 “ and your Petitioners are prepared to shew by
 “ legal evidence, that FORTY PEERS, in defiance
 “ of your resolutions, have possessed themselves of
 “ so many Burgage Tenures, and obtained such
 “ an absolute and uncontrouled command in very
 “ many small boroughs in the kingdom, as to be
 “ enabled by their own positive authority to return
 “ EIGHTY-ONE of your Honourable Members.”

Here, then, are charges of that “ first and
 “ highest treason,” of that “ greatest of all trea-
 “ sons,” described by Lord *Somers* and Lord
 Chief Justice *Eyre*; although not comprehended
 in the statute: here are also alledged conspiracies
 by which those treasons are said to be carried into
 execution; and here are offers to prove the overt-
 acts:—but alas! the Tribunal to whom these

Borough-mongers, to set forth the overt-acts of conspiracy and
 treason, in still stronger terms than had been exhibited in their
 state of the Representation.

Well might Mr. *Holcroft* exclaim, “ Beware of the hundred
 “ and sixty-two! Beware of the oligarchy! Beware of iron-
 “ handed Despotism! Beware of gore-streaming Civil War!”—
Narrative, p. 52.

serious

serious accusations and these solemn offers of proof were tendered, must be swayed by its majority; and that majority, it seems, are the creatures of the 154 accused persons !!! !!! !!!—The Indictment was read: the Indictment was put upon the Records of the Tribunal: but the cause was not tried: justice was not done.* And was not such a proceeding sufficient to shock the People of England! Must that House, under *the same influence*, instead of adhering to its legislative character, instead even of fulfilling its duty as a self-constituted Tribunal, and instead of confining its accusatory functions to the single case of impeachment; must that House, I say, endeavour to divert the public attention from the conspiracy and treason charged

* “ The ground we have gained by the *reception* of our petition, appears to us to be important, and the station it gives us impregnable. It is not a circumstance of little moment to the cause of reform; that a Petition stating to the House of Commons itself, such facts and such arguments, with a direct offer on the part of the petitioners, to establish every one of their allegations by sufficient evidence, should be received without dispute, and recorded for ever on the votes and Journals of the House. No objection was made to the form or terms of the Petition. NO PART OF ITS CONTENTS WERE DENIED, OR EVEN QUESTIONED. The motion to bring up the Petition was not opposed by any man. The House heard it distinctly read. They ordered it to lie on their table; and after a debate of two days, REFUSED TO APPOINT A COMMITTEE TO TAKE IT INTO CONSIDERATION.”—See *the Authentic Copy of the Petition, &c.* printed for D. Stuart, Friar-street, Soho.

upon

upon its own members in this indictment, involving the very existence of the constitution and of British freedom; by becoming, through the medium of a Secret Committee, a general accuser of whole bodies of men for treasonable practices; and boldly asserting the criminality of those whom they had not tried; but whose innocence has since been manifested to the world by the integrity of English Juries, and by the most laborious trials upon the judicial records of this country !!! !!! !!!

And on whom was this vengeance of the law intended to have fallen? On the members of societies instituted for the very purpose of exposing to public view the daring iniquity of those Borough-mongers, and to snatch from their corrupt and polluted hands and destroy that *imperium in imperio*, that dictatorial authority which they have usurped in order to pilage with impunity an injured people* !!! !!! !!!

Must

* It is impossible that the nation can have duly considered the nature, or the views, of the Borough-monger Faction. Those views ought to be brought to light; to be exposed to every eye; and impressed upon every mind. They involve that with which no national freedom can exist. They are in direct opposition to every thing that has been laid down as *right* in the science of civil government. They tend to unite in the same hands powers that ought for ever to be distinct and totally separate.

1. The *Hundred and Fifty-four* Borough-mongers have in their own hands an absolute monopoly of *Legislative* power; in consequence

Must not the public, after such an attempt, recur with double force and interest to the original *Indictment of the Borough-mongers themselves*, the indictment of the 6th of May, 1793, and expect that the Tribunal to which it was presented, shall no longer delay an inquiry into its merits ! When that inquiry shall

quence of appointing a decided majority of the House of Commons. 2. They have also in effect the whole *executive* authority ; because their monopoly of legislative power renders the crown dependent upon them, instead of national representatives, for its revenue. Hence *they*, in effect, and not the crown, appoint every succeeding ministry ; the great offices of power and emolument are ingrossed by *themselves* and their *immediate creatures* ; and parliamentary interest, that is, *their own influence*, disposes of all other places and employments, down to the meanest exciseman.

3. They arrogate to themselves *judicial* power, in all questions respecting elections ; which power they exercise through a House of which they appoint the decided majority. [This claim to judicial power, I have shewn to be a dangerous usurpation of the House ; and contrary to ancient law. See *Legislative Rights of the Commonwealth vindicated*.] And while this private property in boroughs is suffered to remain, even your *judges* may in their own persons unite the legislative and judicial functions.

4. And, lastly, the accusatory power, which, by the constitution belongs to the Representatives of the people in one case *only*, viz. that of *impeachment*, is also swallowed up by the *hundred and fifty-four* ; and, not submitting to that restraint, we have seen them, as stated in the text, assuming by wholesale and to an indefinite extent, this *accusatory* power ; and—hear it, O Englishmen, to your astonishment,—not accusing THOSE, who, with *the four-fold powers* above mentioned, have monopolized also to themselves

shall have been solemnly made, perhaps the *Solicitor General* will have no cause to complain of a defect of proof: Perhaps he may even have the goodness, in order to prevent unjust decisions, to reveal to the tribunal *all that he knows on the subject*: and it is to be hoped the event would not again call forth the lamentations of Mr. *Wyndham*, on *acquitted felons* being again let loose on society.

When the cases of these contrasted Indictments, the Indictment of the Borough-mongers in 1793, and the Indictment of the Patriots in 1794, with all their accompanying and collateral circumstances, shall have been duly considered, an indignant Public will, I conceive, draw very important conclusions from the whole. It is not the least remarkable circumstance attending their contrast, that the *Attorney*

themselves the crimes of *conspiracy* and *treason* against the constitution; but accusing the very men who have been amongst the foremost in exposing those iniquities!—A more perfect compendium of despotism can scarcely be imagined, than for 154 men, in a capacity utterly unknown and abhorrent to our law and constitution, to engross to themselves all these powers, which the preservation of freedom requires to be for ever kept separate in every state.

Were Mr. *Young* to open my book at this page, he might think I was speaking of the French Convention, which he describes as follows—"As the revolution matures, the hope lessens of a better system establishing itself. Confusion thickens; tyranny deepens its colours; the legislative assumes every day more and more the *executive* and *judiciary* powers, which is, of all circumstances, THE MOST DEFINITIVE OF DESPOTISM." P. 70.

General,

General, the *Solicitor General*, and *Serjeant Adair*, who each opened a prosecution on the occasion, aimed at the life of an innocent man falsely accused, as well as Mr. *Bearcroft*, and Mr. *Anstruther*, assistant counsel in these prosecutions, are every man of them seated in the House of Commons by the patronage and power of Borough-mongers; whose criminality, excepting only in one of the instances, in thus usurping the most sacred power of the people, has the highest aggravation; inasmuch as the parties are *Peers of the Realm*.*

And this daring usurpation is in the teeth of an act of parliament, (3 Ed. I. Westm. I. Ca. 5) as well as of two resolutions, regularly voted by the House of Commons, at the commencement of every session of parliament; 1st, "That no Peer of this
" realm hath any right to give his vote in the
" election of any member to serve in parliament;" and 2dly, "That it is a high infringement upon
" the liberties and privileges of the Commons of
" Great Britain, for any Lord of Parliament, or any

* By the State of the Representation, referred to in the Indictment, or Petition of the 6th of May 1793,

The Marquis of Bath nominates Sir J. Scott, Attorney General to represent his Lordship in the House of Commons.

Lord Beverley nominates Sir J. Mitford, Solicitor General to represent him.

Earl Fitzwilliam nominates Serjeant Adair ditto.

The Earl of Lonsdale nominates Mr. Anstruther ditto.

And Mr. Buller nominates Mr. Bearcroft ditto.

" Lord

“ Lord Lieutenant of any country, to concern themselves in the elections of members to serve for the Commons in Parliament.”

If to be a Borough-monger resisting a reform in the representation, and promoting a system of terror and proscription, to defend the rotten-borough usurpation, is to *conspire against the state*; then it should seem that the doctrine of *constructive treason*, had the attempt to establish it on the late trials succeeded, might perhaps have recoiled upon its authors, and sent them to Tyburn; in which case even these gentlemen, these managers of the accusations against *Hardy*, *Tooke* and *Thelwall*, for the reason already assigned, might have found themselves somewhat *implicated* in the charge. It were an implication which, I must say, would not sit quite so easy on myself, as that which the *Attorney General* was pleased to lay upon me, of having a share in the proceedings of the society for Constitutional Information in the spring of the year 1792. That the learned gentleman may have an opportunity of implicating me still farther with the Reformers, I refer him to the Appendix, No. 3, for a letter in behalf of one of them, condemned to transportation for fourteen years,* which I wrote to a member of the Cabinet in December 1793; and I refer him also to the *Duke of Portland*, for the reasons I assigned to his Grace in July last for requesting leave to

* Mr. Muir.

visit Mr. *Tooke* in the Tower. They were reasons not very flattering to the corporation of Borough-mongers.

But, before I take leave of this Roberstperian fraternity and their friend the *Attorney General*, I must remind the learned gentleman of certain words which in the fervour of his zeal in their cause, on the trial of Mr. *Tooke*, and with peculiar enthusiasm, he emphatically pronounced. After a trial of many days, during which not a particle of the guilt charged in the Indictment had been proved by a single witness, the *Attorney General*, in a reply of some hours, exerted his strong talents, and all his bitter eloquence, against the confessedly innocent prisoner, in the extraordinary hope of prevailing with an English Jury—TO CONDEMN AGAINST EVIDENCE!!! With what sympathy the learned gentlemen entered into the feelings of the proscribing Borough-mongers; how anxious he was to sacrifice the man whom they hate and dread; how eager to spill the blood which warms the undaunted and patriot breast of their determined opposer; all present must have indignantly felt; and all England, to her remotest shores, now feels. But when the darling *Boroughs* are uppermost in his mind, when that all-inspiring theme fires his imagination, he takes a bolder flight; he soars to an higher pitch; and even royal blood—the blood of his king and offensive master it seems may be shed, if his Majesty

to touch the sacred system with the little finger of reform. His words were these;—"If the king should consent to act with any representation other—wise than as it is now constituted, HE OUGHT TO DIE; AND I TRUST IN GOD HE WOULD DIE."* Yes; yes; Mr. Attorney General; we know the temper of an Oligarchy, that have once stolen from the People their Representation, and from the King his Independence. He must thenceforth be the passive pageant of their fraudulent government—the organ of their despotism—and *more* obsequious to their nod, or unpitied he falls at the shrine of their desperate ambition! If these memorable words from the lips of one largely sharing in the power, the honours and emoluments of our joint sovereigns the Borough-mongers, from the lips of the commander in chief of their legal forces, employed to exterminate all who rebel against *their* sovereignty, shall not, like a trumpet in the ears of this sleepy

* Upon hearing these words Mr. Tooke jumped up and said—
 "My Lord! What is that?—Have I misheard?—Don't let me afterwards be told, that this was not said.—Does the Attorney General say, that if the king consents to act with any other representation but that as it is at present constituted, he ought to die, and he trusts in God he would die?" [A murmur about the irregularity of interruption] "I am not likely to interrupt the Attorney General upon any other occasion. Suffer this interruption, which will be the only one; for I must know, whether in a prosecution of me for High Treason, the Attorney General himself says something worse than any thing with which he has charged me."

G

nation,

nation, awaken it to its true *internal* danger, 'tis the sleep of death that is upon it; 'tis past the efficacy of stimulants; and nought but a resurrection can renew its political life!

But mark the contradictions, in which a support of this monstrous system involves the Attorney General. Either his present Majesty *may* assent to laws for altering the state of representation; or *William III.* and *George I.* *ought to have died* for assenting to the triennial and septennial acts: either acts of parliament now made *might* restore rights; or those acts which invaded them are nullities, and the Attorney General is not at this moment a member of Parliament. But in the present critical and alarming situation of this country, what tremendous doctrines to go forth from such high authority!—that the legislature has not power to redress the greatest of all wrongs which the people can suffer!—that the life of the king stands between them and that redress!—Must not the Attorney General see to what consequences such doctrines lead!—And how he can guard against their fatal effects, but by immediately acknowledging his error, and bringing into parliament a bill for giving the people *legislative* redress, I confess that I am not able to discover.

As

As Mr. *Young's* mode of fixing on the number of men to be now armed is merely arbitrary, we ought to seek a better rule. And as a failure on the part of the Powers of *Europe* to form that unexampled union he points out, and to attack *France* with more energy than ever, would, as he thinks, put us in a situation to demand "double attention to the means of providing for the defence of this island," so we certainly ought not to limit the number of armed men to any thing less than our population and our property will supply. I know of no line so unexceptionable, so constitutional, and so easily drawn, as that of arming every taxed householder.*

G 2

If

* "In the various accounts of these antient free-boroughs, or *Tithings*, they are sometimes mentioned as consisting only of *ten men*; at other times as consisting of *ten men* and their families: and therefore, as all males, from 15 to 60 years of age, are required by law to have arms and be duly exercised therein, (which in a former tract I have already proved) the number of males in a *tithing* of the latter description would amount to about thirty, (the proper number for a platoon) if the average rate of 3 males to a family might be supposed a just estimation, including sons, lodgers, apprentices, journeymen, porters, and servants, &c." *Sharpe's Congregational Courts*. P. 13. Whether the immortal *Alfred* was, or was not, the first to introduce in *England* the arming and organizing of the whole community on a regular system, in which the smallest division was a *tithing*, consisting of ten *households*, is not agreed: but it is certain, that he brought his system to such perfection, that, although the country had recently swarmed with thieves and robbers, property at

no

If this were adopted, and if Mr. *Young* be right in supposing three millions of men in the island capable of bearing arms, this rule would probably give us a militia of about one million of men. Out of those from 18 to 30 years of age, as recommended by *Harrington*, might be formed the marching armies; and the remainder might act as garrisons, as armies of reserve, and as conservators of the public peace; especially in the metropolis and great cities. The horse, of course, would be composed of those who were best able to support the expence of that equipment.*

I mean

no period, either before or since, was ever so secure in this country, as under his administration. And had his law been strictly adhered to, and his example followed by his successors, the same causes must have produced similar effects, in other reigns; making only some allowance for less enlightened and less vigorous minds. The system itself, in its military part, may be found in the Roman armies; which were most admirably constituted; but it had yet an higher original, and an original which *Alfred* seems to have had most in his eye—the commonwealth of *Israel*, in which every man, the Levites only excepted, as set apart to the priesthood, was both a citizen and a soldier.—Upon both these models, *Alfred* improved; so that his militia, besides being an effective army, were the best conservators of the peace that any country ever knew.

* As particular persons, from infirmity, may be incapable of bearing arms, some commutation of service might be allowed: But in a point of so high importance, it ought not to be in the power of any man to divest himself of his military character for
flight

I mean not to enter into any detail, nor to explain any part of the system of military defence, when serious invasion may call the militia into the field; but I must say a few words. As that system is of some extent; as a great multitude of labourers and artizans might be wanting, to act as pioneers and in a variety of capacities, so that no armed man should be lost to the ranks; as much arrangement would be required for supplying the armies with

slight reasons, or without being taxed. A person of the lowest degree in the scale of fortune, if incapable of personal duty, might provide one substitute, a degree higher, two, higher still, three, four or five, or else, in all cases find one substitute, and the remaining contribution go towards providing ammunition, &c. &c. And it seems on every account advisable, that men in situations to keep domestic servants; as well as those who keep several servants in agriculture, manufacture or trade; should, according to some certain scale, be required to arm some of these servants, as securities to the peace. But in all cases, where a master, or a principal, armed servants or substitutes, such master or principal to be sureties for the good behaviour of those they arm; under a penalty that would not be trifled with. This regulation would come within the principle of the antient Frank-Pledge, and ought to be strictly attended to.

Many, no doubt, have been surprized to hear of the good discipline of the French armies in Brabant, and the different character given, by many accounts, of the British troops. Supposing these reports founded in fact—a point on which I pretend not to decide—there could be little reason to doubt the real cause. The French armies are a *militia*, formed as I conceive on the principle now recommended, supplied by draughts taken by lot: the others are men collected by the same modes as are in use for raising all the *standing armies of Europe*.

every requisite, and for depriving the enemy of all support or relief; as regular modes of intelligence ought to be previously settled; and rules laid down for draughting from the two millions of unarmed men all necessary assistants for every species of service; and as a newly formed militia of one million must be very deficient in the routine of field duty, and in a sufficient corps of experienced officers to prevent a thousand inconveniences, and to keep so vast a machine from disorder, as well as to direct its movements with effect; so there doubtless ought to be prepared by government, under the authority of a special act of parliament, a general plan of military defence in case of invasion; having reference to all the necessary objects, and instructing every principal officer, every civil magistrate, every commissary, &c. &c. in the outline of his duty; and copies of such plan should be in the hands of all necessary persons. A General, then, might have some dependance on his orders being duly executed in the main, even in the infancy of experience; confusion might be prevented; much blood might be saved; and all concerned would act with regularity and confidence; than which, nothing could more contribute to success.

But there is another view in which I must consider this *new*, or, I should rather say this *true* militia—for none other deserves the name. It has been

been already intimated that, in a national view, when a people turn out to defend themselves, ARMS and LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION are inseparable. It follows, that an armed nation would smile at Mr. *Young's* conceit, of an House of Commons which is *not* to speak the voice of the Commons. The same imperious necessity, therefore, which compels us to resort to our inherent energies for national salvation, gives us at one and the same time, a truly constitutional militia and a truly constitutional House of Commons. An unanswerable argument to shew the excellence of our constitution ; in the safe harbour of which we find perfect security, when driven thither by the tempest of adversity. And here another important constitutional truth, from the reception of which timid minds are terrified by idle fancies and false alarms, becomes manifested, and appears in its native beauty. The so-much-reprobated principal of *universal suffrage*, or *personal representation*, which, according to the reveries of Mr. *Young*, leads to nothing but to the destruction of property, to anarchy and blood, when viewed in its proper connection, will be seen to be no more than the political application of that divine precept which says, *do unto others as you would that others should do unto you* ; and equally peaceable and harmless. Suppose for an instant that, together with the arming of the people as already described, universal suffrage was to be established. Suppose further, that the people

without property should wish to dispossess those who had it. Must it not be recollected, that those people of property would also be the very persons who would have the arms, and that their adversaries would have none? In case of a contest, would those who had once a year a *vote*, or those who had all the year round *balls and bayonets*, be most likely to come off victorious? To imagine that the unconnected, unarmed, unorganized and unprovided cottagers and mechanics of this country, could despoil of their lands and goods a million of armed nobles, gentlemen, merchants, traders, and farmers compacted, organized, and completely provided with every requisite for war, were a chimera fit only for the brain of a madman.

But in every view, the notion of danger from the principle of universal suffrage appears to me perfectly ridiculous. A vote is neither a pike nor a pitch-fork; nor does it qualify a man to commit personal violence or robbery. If therefore it give no aid in this respect, the poor who are without votes are *even now* just as well prepared to take away our property as if they had votes; and the rich, moreover (generally speaking) are *not* armed. And it should seem as if the injustice, the unkindness, the contempt, or what else you please to call it, of denying the poor man his vote, were much more likely to provoke him to make free with your property,

property, than if you allowed him that vote. As it is POLITICAL LIBERTY, being the *effect* of which PERSONAL REPRESENTATION is the *cause*, that makes a man in political society a *person* and not a *thing*; that consoles him in poverty with the rich idea that, by his nature, he is the *equal* of every other son of man, while he knows that in his moral capacity he is equally the object of his heavenly Father's regard; I can see nothing in the denial of the right of suffrage, but an unnecessary degradation of a fellow-creature, below that order of beings in which God has thought fit to place him; tending to depress his mind, and debase his heart; for which essential injury to *society*, it receives not the shadow of a compensation by the poor man's exclusion from voting. Judge *Blackstone*, relative to the lawfulness of punishing criminals, observes that "*the law by which they suffer, was made by their own consent*; it is a part of the original contract into which they have entered, when they first engaged in society; it is calculated for, and has long contributed to their own safety."* Hence it follows by undeniable consequence, that if you put men out of a condition to give assent to the laws, you ought not to punish their non-observance of them.

What would be the condition of political society if the husbandman and the artizan were not mem-

* Commentaries iv. 8.

bers of it? Where would be the wealth, the strength, or grandeur of the state, if these persons were abstracted? Would not grass grow in our streets, and the country be a desert? Strip things of their outside shew, and men of external advantages, and then tell me whether he who weaves, or he who wears, the broad-cloth, is the most useful member of political society; or whether those whose productive labour actually *create* the wealth of the state, and all the means of revenue, or those whose only merit, like that of the hog in the stie, is to *consume*, and to live on the labour of others, most deserve the title of citizens.

Seeing then, that the vote of the poor man cannot harm the rich, let us consider if it will not be our wisdom to allow him the exercise of it. As enjoyment is in the mind, and as happiness so much depends on imagination, how can we give the poor man such an attachment to the constitution, such a respect for the law, and such a love of his country; such a desire of public peace, and such a satisfaction in his own personal condition, as by leaving him the proud and pleasing consciousness that even HE has a voice in electing the rulers of the land! With him who feels not the force of this argument, it were in vain to reason. Such solid benefits to a country never surely were so cheaply purchased!

But

But this reconciliation, this attachment of two millions of men to the government were not all the benefit.* Mixed at our elections with the armed citizens, we should then have *three millions* of electors instead of *one million*: consequently under a plan of equal representation, every elective body appointed to return one representative, would be thrice as numerous as if the poor were excluded. Now, there are but three principles in nature by which we can practically keep elections incorrupt; 1st, the numerousness of the elective body; 2d, the shortness of the period for which power is to be conferred on the person chosen; and 3d, the ballot:† and if we are very strong in the *first* of these principles, some think we may dispense with the *third*. How immensely important, then, are the votes of the poor!

* I keep to Mr. *Young's* calculation of persons able to bear arms, merely for the sake of brevity.

† So far, in the opinion of many, is the ballot from being considered as a principle of security to liberty, that they condemn it as utterly inconsistent with the very character of freedom. It is a question which lies, as I think, somewhat deep in the well of truth. I wish that some one, fraught with historical information and a profound knowledge of man, would give the subject that ample discussion which, from its importance, it seems to deserve. From very high authority now in *England*, I understand that the Ballot is generally, if not universally, adopted in the elections of Representatives to serve in the Assemblies of *America*, within the limits of the *United States*.

I have

I have nothing to say to the *sixty-five* statutes in our books, for preventing bribery, &c. at elections; which, if things continue in the present impure channels, may in another reign, for ought that I see to the contrary, grow up to six hundred; knowing that, besides, the three principles above mentioned, all the arrangements and regulations that can be necessary to give them such effect, as to set either bribery or improper influence at complete defiance, might be compressed into a single statute of a few pages. When the reader attends to what I have urged in favour of universal suffrage; when he considers how the hearts of men are formed for its reception; when he adverts to the broad fact, that it has made twenty times more reformers, and reformers twenty times more determined, than all the other fancies about parliamentary amendment put together; he will not be surprized that such a principle should meet with peculiar reprobation, or that its advocates should be objects of persecution.

But I would not be misunderstood. I would not wish to be considered as an obstinate bigot to an useless abstract doctrine. No: it is for its *practical* utility that I approve the principle; and I give my reasons. The reasons of those who take the other side of the question I have duly considered. It is a subject on which I think it probable, that I have

have read most of what has been ably published; and I have also conversed and corresponded on it with men of learning and first rate talents; but without altering my opinion. If, however, the poor shall be content to remain unrepresented; if our adversaries shall concede to us annual elections and the extension of suffrage to the one million of taxed householders, to be *equally* divided; and if that one million instead of the three millions, under fair and honest regulations, shall prove sufficient to keep our elections incorrupt; so far as my individual opinions and wishes go, it will be a reform that will have my sincere concurrence and approbation: But nothing short of this can, in my judgment, be either proposed or acceded to, by honest men truly comprehending the nature and ends of representation.

Although I can see perfection in a first principle, and can comprehend the importance to mankind of such principles, as goals of excellence, as standards of conduct; I can also see, that men may be saved either morally or politically, without acting up to the full perfection of those standards. Lamentable indeed would be the case of every christian, if all were to be damned who equalled not Christ in purity and holiness! And as a christian may be saved by good inclinations and a certain approximation towards that standard of excellence; so may a state
be

be saved, without carrying every principle of freedom to its utmost extent. But woe to that christian, and to that state, whose departure from principle is not the mere effect of frailty and want of firmness, but of a corrupt heart and intentional depravity!

Let us now return, once more, to a consideration of the means, whereby we may cope with *France*, until we can adjust our differences by a lasting peace. *She must be opposed*, says Mr. Young, on principles as energetic as her own, and I agree with him. But where, in England, in any thing springing from the filth of rotten-boroughs, are those principles to be found? They are purely and absolutely republican. Whether we take the idea of Sir James Stewart, or of Harrington, as both are quoted by Mr. Young, we find that in a republic only such energies are found to dwell: and the cause is in nature. The present astonishing power of the infant republic of *France*, not only confirms the doctrine; but it affords a striking proof, how well Harrington understood the subject on which he wrote. 'Tis now much more than an hundred years ago since he tendered to Cromwell his Oceana, as a plan of republican government worthy his adoption. And, as if it were to stimulate the supposed patriotism of the Protector, to give his country the foremost rank amongst the nations, he touches

touches in a masterly manner on the case of *France*; in which, even in her then wretched condition, he sees the latest seeds of renovation; and illumined by his genius, he unfolds her future day of greatness.

But he goes farther: for such was his insight into the different effects of different forms, and such his knowledge of the extreme inferiority of arbitrary to free governments, that he confidently pronounces what will happen to the nations around, whenever the government of *France* shall become free. "If France, Italy, and Spain," says he, "were not all sick, all corrupted together, there "would be *none of them so*; for the sick would "not be able to withstand the sound, nor the sound "to preserve their health without curing of the "sick. The first of these nations (which, if you "stay her leisure, will in my mind be *France*) "that recovers the health of antient prudence, "shall certainly govern the world; for what did "*Italy* when she had it? And as you were in that, "so shall you in the like case be reduced to a province; I do not speak at random. *Italy*, in the "consulship of *Lucius Æmilius Papus*, and *Caius Atilius Regulus*, armed, upon the *Gallic* tumult that "then happened, of herself, and without the aid of "foreign auxiliaries, 70,000 horse, and 700,000 "foot: But as *Italy* is the least of those three
"countries

“ countries in extent, so is *France* now the most
“ populous.”*

Now he must be a superficial observer who does not see, that this prophetic idea is in a manner realizing very fast; and that republican principles, which, while they render the government of *France*, that is built upon them, irresistible in war; are at the same time to all the governments of an arbitrary, that is, of an anti-republican form, with which she has to contend, the very means of weakness and decay. Thus it is, that the sick cannot withstand the sound; nor could the sound preserve their health without curing of the sick. Is the republic of *France* then to govern the world; and *Britain* to be reduced to a province of that republic? This last, in my serious judgment, may depend upon the temper and fidelity of a few men in this country, and upon the earliest measures of parliament when next it assembles.†—That *France*, if she do not by the sword directly subdue the other considerable states of *Europe*, and rule them immediately by her own power and authority; may yet have vast influence in bringing to ruin their present governments, and in modelling new ones congenial with her own, is highly probable. And though *Harrington* seems to have entertained the

* *Harrington's Works*, p. 203.

† Written in December, 1794.

idea of military conquest, yet, as it could only be by *republican principles* that *the sick could be made sound*, so that state which overturns other states by her principles rather than by the sword, may, without much of a figure, be said to govern them.

But, happy is it for *Britain*, that the cure of *her* sickness does not imply a dissolution of her government;—that she may be made sound, by merely acting upon the genuine principles of her own constitution;—and, in short, that in case we may depend on right conduct being the consequence of just conception, she may provide for her safety, and may attain to republican energy and greatness, by simply shaking off a single pernicious error insidiously inculcated upon her, and recovering a clear knowledge and conviction of this fundamental and important truth;—that her government is in fact no other than a REPUBLIC or COMMONWEALTH, nor will admit of any other earthly definition. Although our Commonwealth be not balanced, nor regulated according to the rules of *Harrington*, yet, speaking of the “three orders of a Commonwealth,” viz. monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, or, to use his own words, “partaking of the *aristocracy* as in the senate; of the *democracy*, as in the people; and of *monarchy*, as in the magistracy, it is complete. He says, “Now there being no other Commonwealth but

H

this

“ this in art or nature, it is no wonder if *Machia-*
 “ *vel* has shewed us that the antients held this only
 “ to be good.”*

Muddy-headed men talk of *limited* monarchy, and *mixed* monarchy; which are as absolute contradictions in terms, as if they were to call the word, *monarchy*, a monosyllable. As referring to our constitution, there might be sense in calling it a *mixed* democracy; because the democratic power is mixed with power both regal and aristocratic; but in the rule of ONE, there can be no mixture: to the rule of ONE, there can be no limitation. But if, as I conceive, a commonwealth means a government, of which the common weal of the whole people is the object; and power, wisdom, and goodness are the attributes; as having for its component parts democracy, aristocracy and regality; it must be admitted that I have rightly denominated the British government. Nor is it for the sake of words, but of things, I wish this distinction to be seriously attended to. It is a distinction which, if properly regarded, may not only preserve our existence as a people against a foreign foe, by giving us a true republican energy; but ultimately it may save both aristocracy and regality from being swept away by that strong and increasing current of opinion, which already begins to threaten them

* *Oceana*, p. 48.

with utter extinction throughout *Europe*, except where they may find safety *under the wings of a real commonwealth*. It is a distinction also, which may be the speedy means of healing all our political wounds, and reconciling our domestic differences before they take too serious a complexion. Thus it may even prevent that most dreadful state of society, wherein the liberties of a people can only be preserved by that last of resources, a civil war.

It is not possible,—it is not in nature, that the *democracy* of this country, the millions who possess the bulk of landed and of all other property, can recede from their just and constitutional claim, that their branch of the legislature be reformed and purified, so as to sympathize with their feelings, and to speak their voice. If, then, the royal ear is to be poisoned with definitions of our government, misleading and teaching the king that it is a MONARCHY; and if the FEW—the BOROUGH-MONGERS, who, in fact, constitute a hateful OLIGARCHY, that holds both king and people in chains, are to flatter themselves with hopes of sheltering their usurpation, by passing it off as that sort of influence which *aristocracy* ought to possess; and if this OLIGARCHY, this beast with the great belly, that has got both aristocracy and regality in its maw, shall be so rash as to push its daring pretensions to keep the House of Commons there

also, what in the end must be the dreadful consequence!

Oligarchy is defined by *Harrington* to be the government of A FEW against the natural balance of a state; and he instances the Roman *Decemvirs*. Now these *Decemvirs* were invested with *their* power by law; yet that power being unnatural, or contrary to the nature and balance of the Roman constitution, it was first abused, and then taken from them. But our oligarchy is as unknown to the law, as it is abhorrent to the constitution. It is a thief that has stolen in unseen, and seized the reins of government in the dark. It is a deadly faction, ruling by the worst of all engines, an elective Dictatorship; and while it cajoles the king by infamous adulations about his divinity, his sacredness, and his imaginary power; and terrifies him with tales about that raw-head-and-bloody-bones, the people; it at the same time filches from him his real authority, to arm and grace its own tool; and tramples his independence and honour in the dirt. It is, in short, that with which no government ever did or can subsist; it is an *imperium in imperio*, over-ruling King, Lords and Commons, and reducing this once-glorious fabric to an empty name, a bye-word, a shadow!

From

From the election of Dictator *Bute* to that of Dictator *Pitt*, when has his Majesty had the free, full, and independent choice of his various representatives for exercising the royal functions? When has he been able to select men for the respective offices of his government, on account of their peculiar fitness for the intended stations, *without regard to their family or factious connections*? And where is the wisdom or virtue that even the nation, through application to the crown, can call into its service, without permission of this omnipotent! In proportion to the ability and spirit of the Dictator, he himself shares in patronage with his electors; and he tells his nominal master, brother John must preside at this board; brother William at that; brother Richard at the third; and brother James at a fourth: then cousin Samuel must command in the south; cousin Alexander in the west; and as many cousins more as are to be found in a Welsh pedigree, must all share in the good things: then again friend Harry must govern here; friend Tom there; and another, and another must each have his department; or *his Majesty's government cannot be supported; nor his service carried on*. His Majesty, good easy man, feeling the full force of what Mr. *Burke* so beautifully calls *aristocratic connection*; not knowing which way to turn, nor how to help himself, nor, as that impudent fellow *Paine* would express it, being *up to* this impudent

humbug, smiles assent, ratifies the appointments, and then mounts his horse for the chace;—and there alone does he seem to meet with those who render him honest service, and who never deceive him—his horses and his hounds.*

In an early part of this Essay, it is said, that adversity is a good school, and necessity an eloquent teacher. This teacher, by instructing *the nation* to arm, averts all danger from within as well as from without. “Wherever the balance of
“a government lies, there naturally is the militia
“of the same; and against him or them wherein
“the militia is naturally lodged, there can be no
“negative voice.”† Now that necessity, I say, at length compels us to make those the militia in whom resides the natural balance‡ of the Commonwealth, all will go well; the constitution will

* — “at such moments the leaders of that House [the House of Commons] have contented themselves with seizing the administration of the executive power, without attacking the power itself.”—*Young’s Example of France a Warning to Britain*, p. 251.

† *Harrington*, p. 388.

‡ By this language, I must not be understood to confound *natural* with *just*. If one man, as *Pharaoh* or a *Grand Seigneur*, be lord of the whole land; this, in the sense of *Harrington*, *naturally* produces monarchy, however *unjust*, and hateful such a government may be. But when a people are become the great proprietors of the soil, liberty, always *just*, is then also *natural* to the state. Nothing, indeed; but some political MONSTER, equally abhorrent to *nature* and to *justice*, can prevent it.

return

return to its old foundations ; and the oligarchy will soon be heard of no more. The people, in whom resides the strength, the solidity and *power* of the state, will form the broad base and the substantial body of the constitutional pyramid : from them it will ascend and contract into the elective aristocracy, their representatives ; then again, still ascending and lessening into the hereditary aristocracy the peerage, in these two we shall behold the *wisdom* that is to balance between the people and the executive magistrate ; and finally we find the crown forming the apex of the pyramid, and recognize that *goodness* which is the attribute of him who executes what power and wisdom, combining for the public good, have prescribed.

The adversaries of freedom may object, that when the House of Commons shall truly represent all the *power* of the people, and possess amongst themselves more than a moiety of the *wisdom* of the aristocracy, the peerage and the crown will be in danger. Why so ? If the Commons shall have power to obtain good laws, a faithful execution of those laws, and an impartial administration of justice, what more can they want ? 'Tis not honours well bestowed : 'tis not a civil list rightly applied ; with which they are likely to find fault. No : such honours and such an establishment will then reflect lustre on themselves. Bestowing grandeur on that govern-

ment which is constituted by and for themselves, it will be their own grandeur, and an object of their guardianship. Their House of Representatives, if rightly constituted, cannot be corrupted. The maintenance, therefore, of the royal dignity, will be no object of their jealousy. To insinuate that, because possessed of liberty and all that good government can secure to man, they would therefore, through mere wantonness and folly, violate forms sanctioned by antiquity, and to which they and their ancestors have ever been attached, were to betray an ignorance of man; who is the child of prejudice and habit, as much as of reason and nature. To pull down regal magistracy under one denomination, for the mere pleasure of building it up again under another, were silly work; and the like may be said of the aristocratic order.

Let those orders, then, make common cause with the democracy, in annihilating that odious, infamous oligarchy of Borough-mongers, so hostile, so disgraceful to them all; that oligarchy who in fact, *bind their king in chains, their nobles in fetters of iron, and the people in shackles of brass*. But supposing for a moment the hereditary orders should entertain fears, that the people once made free, and acting through an independant House of Commons, might think some of their privileges might be dispensed with. What then? Laying such fears in

one scale, and the rights and liberties of millions in the other, which ought to preponderate. But when the salvation of *Britain* is at stake, is it honourable to the king and three hundred nobles, to talk of their fears ! When *Laconia* was to be saved, *Lacedemon* heard not of the fears of her king *Leonidas*, and the three hundred noble Spartans who took post at *Thermopylæ*.

But fear of a free and happy people is out of the question. Should they find the king and the nobles put a willing hand to the works of reform, so that the only fundamental grievance of which the people complain should be smoothly and pleasantly redressed, he who should undertake to make them contend for more, must know little of mankind : nor would our privileged orders, it may safely be affirmed, ever more give the people cause of dissatisfaction.

It is now near twenty years since an equal representation in annual parliaments was proposed with some earnestness to the public ; and notwithstanding the magnitude, the enormity, the atrocity of the evil for which such an alteration is the proper remedy, and the infinite number of publications which since that period have recommended parliamentary reform ; as well as the numerous associations and societies that have exerted themselves in the cause ; and with extraordinary effect

fect in producing conviction ; yet so slow have the people been in acting upon this conviction, that, notwithstanding the present appearances, and the strong necessity that is pressing upon the nation, nothing is yet actually done. How extravagant, then, the hope, of moving the people to pull in pieces a government, from which they cannot receive injury, which reason does not condemn, and to which they are attached by habit and partiality !

At the present juncture, when the science of politics, producing *republican*, which is only another word for *free* government, is rapidly putting down political ignorance, bigotry and imposture ; and consequently laying the axe to the root of all monarchy and aristocracy, *as distinct governments, or as the preponderating ingredients in compound ones*, the example of the wise and high-minded *Elizabeth* may deserve the consideration of his Majesty ; who, from the advantage of more light on the subject than had been collected in the days of that princess, may be able so far to improve upon her example, as to transmit his throne with security and peace to his posterity ; at the same time that he secures and satisfies his people.

When I define our government to be a *Commonwealth*, as doubtless it had been in the time of that best of kings, whose maxim it was, that an *Englishman*

man ought to be as free as his own thoughts, I am not ignorant, that in the hands of the Norman conqueror and tyrant, it became a *monarchy*. It soon, however, changed to a turbulent compound of monarchy and aristocracy. Then on a restoration, or as some will have it, a creation of popular representation, it required a portion of democracy; and by the court, which was alternately paid to the people by tyrant kings and tyrant barons, as well as from a commercial acquisition of property, the principle of democracy gained strength. But it was not until the reign of *Hen. VII.* the foundations were laid of real free government; enabling the people afterwards to make head against the divine right of the *Stewarts*, and finally at the revolution, to give the government a republican *form and body*; in which democracy, aristocracy and regality had their several parts and places assigned them, and an attempt (though but a lame one) was made to *balance* them one against the other.

This attempt at a balance, inasmuch as making all the people of property a militia, and the House of Commons a true representation of the people, were both neglected. has failed of its effects, and if uncorrected, must shortly, I fear, ruin the fabric; yet it is beyond all question, that, notwithstanding the ancient phrases and stile of "kingdom"—"monarchy"—"his Majesty's dominions," and so forth,
were

were most unwisely suffered still to pass current, the government in its composition, form, frame and substance, was truly a commonwealth. But indeed, from its Saxon ancestry, and from the popular blood in its veins, it had in many seasons and at very early periods, been so stiled in acts of parliament, as may be seen by consulting the statute book.*

Now

* See 6 Richard II. Stat. 1. "To the praise and honour of
"Almighty God, the profit of the realm of England, and the
"service of the *Republic*," &c.

31 Hen. VIII. c. 10. "Forasmuch as in all great councils
"and congregations of men, having sundry degrees and offices
"in the COMMONWEALTH, it is very requisite," &c.

1 Ed. VI. c. 1. — "To the intent that his loving subjects, pro-
"voked by clemency and goodness of their prince and king, shall
"study rather for love than for fear, to do their duties; first to
"Almighty God, and then to his Highness and the COMMON-
"WEALTH," &c.

Queen *Elizabeth*, in her speech to the Deputies of the Com-
mons, Anno 1061, see *Rapin*. "I know that the COMMON-
"WEALTH is to be governed for the good and advantage of
"those that are committed to me; not of myself," &c. And
again; "I think myself most happy that, by God's assistance,
"I have hitherto so prosperously governed the COMMON-
"WEALTH in all respects."

James I. anno 1621, says, "The king makes laws, and ye
"are to advise to make such as will be best for the Common-
"wealth!" *Rapin*.

Sir *Thomas Smith*, privy-counsellor of *Elizabeth*, wrote a treatise, entitled, "of the COMMONWEALTH of England." It concludes

Now the wise conduct of *Elizabeth*, which I most sincerely recommend to the imitation of his Majesty, may be found recorded in *Harrington*; than whom I know of no counsellor, dead or living, more capable of giving sound advice to kings and nobles at this period; a period peculiarly awful to them; and calling on them to exercise all their wisdom and all their virtue. If they will listen only to the counsels offered them by such friends as Mr. *Burke* Mr. *Wyndham*, Mr. *Jenkinson*, Mr. *Canning*, and Mr. *Young*, I fear their downfall is sealed. But if they will faithfully consult the sage, to whose venerable page I shall direct their eye, their names and honours may remain to future generations, and the exotic laurel of exclusive privilege, entwined

concludes thus; "Since, therefore, this is the true image of
"our COMMONWEALTH as I have described it, let us compare
"it with the other forms of COMMONWEALTHS now existing,
"and see its differences," &c.

Sir *John Davis* also, Attorney General to the same queen, in the preface to his Reports, speaks thus; "And here I may observe, for the honour of our nation and of our ancestors, who
"have founded this COMMONWEALTH," &c.

And Lord Coke, in the preface to the third part of his Reports, likewise says,—"For which labours, if the COMMONWEALTH
"shall have derived any benefit," &c.

And *Blackstone* says—"Every member of the British parliament, though chosen by one particular district when elected and returned, serves for the whole nation. For the end of his coming thither is not particular, but general; not barely to advantage his constituents, but the COMMONWEALTH." &c.

with

with the democratic oak, may adorn the brows of their posterity.

Harrington has a short chapter on *the principles or balance of national governments, with the different kinds of the same*. He then, in the succeeding chapter, proceeds to consider *the variation of the English Balance*.* This chapter being full of instruction, I shall transcribe the greater part of it; and that I may not disturb the attention of the reader, I shall not interrupt him by marginal notes, but merely number the passages I mean to notice, and at the end of the quotation offer my remarks in numerical order.

“ The lands,” says he, “ in possession of the nobility and clergy of *England*, till *Henry VII.* cannot be esteemed to have overbalanced those held by the people less than four to one. Whereas in our days, the clergy being destroyed, the lands in possession of the people overbalance those held by the nobility, at least nine in ten.” (1.) “ The court was yet at *Bridewell*, nor reached *London* any farther than *Temple Bar*. The latter growth of this city, and in that the declining of the balance to popularity, derives from the decay of the nobility and of the clergy. (2.) In the reign

“ of the succeeding king were Abbies (than which
“ nothing more dwarfs a people) demolished. I
“ did not, I do not attribute the effects of these
“ things thus far to my own particular observation;
“ but always did, and do attribute a sense thereof
“ to the reign of queen *Elizabeth*, and the wisdom
“ of her council. There is yet living testimony,
“ that the ruin of the English monarchy, (3.)
“ through the causes mentioned, was frequently
“ attributed to *Henry VII.* by Sir *Henry Wotton*;
“ which tradition is not unlike to have descended
“ to him from the queen’s council.

“ But there is a difference between having the
“ sense of a thing, and making a right use of that
“ sense. Let a man read *Plutarch* in the lives of
“ *Agis*, and of the *Gracchi*, there can be no plainer
“ demonstration of the *Lacedemonian* or *Roman*
“ balance; yet read his discourse of government in
“ his morals, and he has forgot it: he makes no
“ use, no mention at all of any such thing. Who
“ could have been plainer upon this point than
“ Sir *Walter Raleigh*, where, to prove that the
“ kings of *Egypt* were not elective but heredi-
“ ary, he alledges that if the kings of *Egypt*
“ had been elective, the children of *Pharaob*
“ must have been more mighty than the king,
“ as landlords of all *Egypt*, and the king him-
“ self their tenant. Yet when he comes to speak
“ of government, he has no regard to, no re-
“ membrance of any such principle. In Mr.
“ *Selden’s*

“ *Selden’s* titles of honour, he has demonstrated
 “ the English balance of the peerage, without ma-
 “ king any application of it, or indeed perceiving
 “ it there or in times where the defect of the same
 “ came to give so full a sense of it. The like might be
 “ made apparent in *Aristotle*, in *Machiavel*, and in
 “ my lord *Verulam*, in all, in any politician: there
 “ is not one of them in whom may not be found as
 “ right a sense of this principle as in this present nar-
 “ rative; or in whom may be found a righter use of
 “ it than was made by any of the parties thus far con-
 “ cerned in this story, or by queen *Elizabeth*
 “ and her council.

“ If a prince, says a great author, to reform a
 “ government were obliged to *depose himself*, he
 “ might, in neglecting it, be capable of some ex-
 “ cuse; but reformation of government being that
 “ with which a *principality*,” [government of a
 “ prince or king] “ may stand, he deserves no ex-
 “ cuse at all. It is not indeed observed by this au-
 “ thor, that where by reason of the declination of
 “ the balance to popularity, the state requires refor-
 “ mation in the superstructures, there the prince can-
 “ not rightly reform, unless from sovereign power,”
 “ [meaning absolute monarchy] “ he descends to
 “ a principality” [princely or kingly power] “ in
 “ a Commonwealth: nevertheless, upon the like
 “ occasions, this fails not to be found so in nature
 “ and experience.” “ The growth of the people
 “ of

“ *England*, since the ruins mentioned of the nobility
 “ and the clergy, came in the reign of queen *Eliza-*
 “ *beth* to more than stood with the interest, or indeed
 “ the nature or possibility of a well founded or dura-
 “ ble *monarchy*; as was prudently perceived, but
 “ withal temporized by her council, who (if the
 “ truth of her government be rightly weighed)
 “ seemed rather to have put her upon the exercise
 “ of principality” [princely or kingly government]
 “ in a commonwealth, than of sovereign” [absolute]
 “ power in a *monarchy*. (5.) Certain it is that she
 “ courted not her nobility, nor gave her mind (as
 “ do monarchs seated upon the like foundation) to
 “ balance her great men, or reflect upon their
 “ power, now inconsiderable, but ruled wholly,
 “ with an art she had to high perfection, by hu-
 “ mouring and blessing her people. (6.)

“ For this mere shadow of a commonwealth is
 “ she yet famous, and shall ever be so; though *had*
 “ *she introduced the full perfection of the orders requi-*
 “ *sited to popular government*, her fame had been
 “ greater. First, she had established such a prin-
 “ cipality to her successors, as they might have *re-*
 “ *tained*. Secondly, this principality (the com-
 “ monwealth, as *Rome* of *Romulus*, being born of
 “ such a parent) might have retained the royal dig-
 “ nity and revenue to the full, both *improved* and
 “ *discharged of all envy*.” “ Thirdly, it had saved
 “ all the blood and confusion, which through *this neg-*

“ *lest* in her and her successors, has since issued.
 “ Fourthly, it had bequeathed to the people a
 “ light not so naturally by them to be discovered,
 “ which is a great pity. For even as the many,
 “ through the difference of opinions that must needs
 “ abound among them, are not apt to introduce a
 “ government, as not understanding the good of
 “ it: so the many, having by trial or experience
 “ once attained to this understanding, *agree not to*
 “ *quit such a government.* And lastly, it had placed
 “ this nation in that *perfect felicity*, which, so far as
 “ concerns mere prudence, is in the power of hu-
 “ man nature to enjoy. (7.)

“ To this queen succeeded king *James*, who like-
 “ wise, regardless of this point (into which never-
 “ theless he saw so far as not seldom to prophecy
 “ sad things to his successors) neither his new
 “ peerage, which IN ABUNDANCE HE CREATED,
 “ nor the old availed him any thing against that
 “ dread wherein, more freely than prudently, he
 “ discovered himself to stand of parliaments, as now
 “ mere popular councils, and running to popularity
 “ of government like a bowl down hill;—not so
 “ much, I may say, of malice prepossessed, as by na-
 “ tural instinct, whereof the petition of right, well
 “ considered, is a sufficient testimony. All per-
 “ suasion of court eloquence, all patience for such
 “ as but looked that way, was now lost. There re-
 “ mained

“mained nothing to the destruction of a *monarchy*,
 “retaining but the name, more than a prince,
 “who by contending, should make the people to
 “feel those advantages which they could not see.

“And this happened in the next king, who, too
 “secure in that undoubted right whereby he was
 “advanced to a throne which had no foundation,
 “dared to put this to an unseasonable trial; on
 “whom therefore fell the tower in Silo. Nor
 “may we think that they upon whom this tower
 “fell, were sinners above all men; *but that we,*
 “*unless we repent, and look better to the true founda-*
 “*tions,* must likewise perish. We have had latter
 “princes, latter parliaments. In what have they
 “excelled? or where are they?—The balance not
 “considered, no effectual work can be made as to
 “settlement; and considered as it now stands in
 “*England*; requires to settlement no less than *the*
 “*superstructures natural to popular government.*” (8)

Under the general head of the *balance*, Harrington
 lays it down as a fundamental principle, which he
 illustrates from history, that the overbalance of
 landed property* to any considerable degree, ine-

* But not wholly to the exclusion of personal property and
 money; which indeed in small states must give great weight;
 and in this commercial country must weigh very heavy indeed in
 the scale.

vitably carries with it the dominion. If that overbalance be in the hands of *one* it produces *monarchy*; if in the hands of *the few*, or the nobility, it produces *aristocracy*; and if in the hands of the people *popular government*. But where the overbalance is not decisive and “down weight” there is generated an imperfect government, *turbulent and bloody*, because of the struggles that will take place for the pre-eminence. And where also, by any accidental cause there is produced a government *against* the natural balance, either tyranny, oligarchy or anarchy is the necessary consequence. I come now to offer some remarks upon what he says on the variation of the English balance, and on the conduct of *Elizabeth*; in the way of notes upon the passages which I have numbered.*

1st. The overbalance at this time in Great Britain being “*down weight*” in the hands of the People, whose aggregate property in lands and personalty is to that of the nobles as a mountain to a mole-hill, it follows that if the government be not popular, it cannot be natural or quiet.

2d. The decay of the nobility here spoken of, was their having been reduced from petty sovereigns

* If some of these notes should appear to the learned to be very superfluous; I wish to be understood, that they are written for the unlearned.

and tyrants, to mere men of antient blood, title, and exclusive privileges, with wealth enough to support their rank with splendour : and the decay of the clergy, was that of their having fallen from the bloated wealth, power and magnificence of a popish priesthood; to become the ministers of a protestant church.

3d. By the words, *ruin of the monarchy*, taken with the context, it is plain *Harrington* does not even include the idea of the abolition of *royalty* by *Cromwell*; but simply means to make the necessary distinction between a *monarch* and a *king*. *Elizabeth*, who had sagacity enough to discern that she was not a *monarch*, and wisdom enough to be content with *royalty*, was crowned with prosperity and glory; whereas *Charles*, on the contrary, wanting this discernment and this wisdom, was, as a prince, contemptible and inglorious; and struggling against nature and liberty for *monarchical* power, lost his crown and his life.

4th. If *Harrington's* principles be just, then the government of Great Britain must henceforth be either popular, that is, natural and agreeable to the balance of property; or else it must be something against nature, factious, and convulsed. If the House of Commons truly represented the people, the government would be POPULAR, as it ought to

be; not only on account of the balance of property making it *natural*; but on account also of its flowing from the whole nation, making it just. We have done with those sublime mysteries, whereby the will and wisdom of one man, or of three hundred men, are made equivalent to the will and wisdom of the millions. Unreflecting persons may imagine that the king and the lords, as independent branches of the legislature, ought to have *equal* power with the House of Commons. But in the present state of things, this were naturally impossible; and to think them entitled to such equality, were a pernicious error. The negative of the crown is, it is true, a shadowy, but not intirely an useless form,

The duke of Richmond, in his letter to colonel Sharman, indeed, says,—“I admit that I am not
“for restoring the negative of the crown. My rea-
“son is, that it appears to me preposterous, that
“the will of one man should for ever obstruct
“every regulation which all the rest of the
“nation may think necessary.” And so long as the power of the purse is wholly in the House of Commons, while the millions to be represented there possess the solid wealth and property of the state, as well as its physical strength, there can be no doubt but that *there* is the true seat and foundation of government, the real solid sovereignty of the
state;

state ; uniting with itself by the will of the people, and for purposes the most salutary, the dignity and wisdom of a nobility ; the splendour and goodness of royalty. And a negative in the crown might possibly be a beneficial prerogative, if only to be exercised to cause a reconsideration of a bill before it passed into a law.

At present, the nobles are nobles, and his majesty is king ; and so they may remain, with the full and free consent of the people : but a despicable OLIGARCHY of *borough-mongers*, having in effect elbowed all the three estates of the Commonwealth out of their independence, discontent has long been brewing, and now agitates the public mind in no small degree. Reformation is therefore necessary ; and our author says, that “ reformation of government, being that with which a principality” [princely or kingly government] “ may stand,” the prince who neglects it is not excusable. What, then, are we to say of those apostates, and those men of *Old Sarum* and *Midhurst*, where *the houseless turf*, and *the very stones in the wall* appoint our legislators ? what shall we say of the whole Rotten-borough faction, who dare to make war upon Reform, by all the arts of corruption and intrigue, by the perversion of law, the infamies of espionage, and a system of terror !—May the infatuation of the day, in contending against nature and nature’s

I 4
rights,

rights, not lead to consequences similar to those which followed a similar infatuation in the last century!

5th. When Alfred, by his fruitful invention, his consummate wisdom, and his heroism, had triumphed over his enemies and was adored by his people, what mortal had ever such temptations to make himself a *monarch*! Free to choose his future relation to his country, he disdained the title of *monarch*, as incompatible with popular liberty; preferring to retain only the situation in which he then stood, that of “*a principality in a commonwealth.*” He *armed* and *organized* the people on the principles of a *true militia*; established *trial by jury*; carried the *administration of justice* to a perfection never known either before or since; he protected and cherished *commerce*; he patronized and diffused *learning*; with piety and sincerity he practised and promoted *religion*; and “in an assembly of parliament enacted this for a perpetual custom, that a parliament should be called together at London twice every year, or oftener, in time of peace, to keep the people of God from sin, that they might live in peace, and receive right, by certain usages and holy judgments.”*

* *Mirroure*, c. 1. §. 3.—In those days and for many centuries afterwards, as often as a parliament was *assembled*, so often was it *elected*.

6th. To the end of "humouring and blessing her people," the first care of *Elizabeth* was to form her council of wise and great men;* and her next, to hold them to the streight line of their duty, by the exertions of her high spirit and the strictness of her discipline; but very sparing was she of titles of honour or pecuniary rewards. The balance of property, although to *Harrington* it appeared in her time to have *changed*; yet, compared with the extent of present times, was only *changing*; so that her wisdom was the greater in so early discerning the alteration, and in making such a practical use of the observation, as he shews had escaped all writers on the subject both antient and modern.

But there is another important balance of a state, besides the balance of property. It is the balance of **OPINION**. This balance, composed for many centuries of ignorance, stupidity, fear, superstition, and imposture; has given throughout the greater part of the continent of Europe "down weight" to *monarchy* and *aristocracy*: but now, by a new creation, which is rapidly forming a balance of intelligence, truth, freedom of thought and manly spirit, *republicanism* goes down, *liberty* is overbalancing,

* There was no Rotten-borough oligarchy in those days, to choose ministers for the queen and representatives for the nation. That happy expedient for humouring and blessing the people was not then invented.

and *monarchy* and *aristocracy* kicking the beam: And has not this balance of *opinion* prevailed, even while the balance of *property*, almost exclusively, was in the contrary scale? Has it not, as it were by enchantment, blown the massive monarchy of *France* into the air, and given her rich nobility and priesthood to the fowls of heaven? After such an example, will princes and nobles, in an age of light and thought, disregard the power of *opinion*? Will they not accommodate their pretensions to the rights and reason of mankind? Will they not part with *words*, that they may retain *things*;—sacrifice the shadows of unsubstantial forms, to bold solid enjoyments;—and exchange invidious and offensive customs, for the esteem, the reverence, and the affections of the people?—May they, therefore, take council of the wise *Elizabeth*, and regulate their conduct by the change in this balance of *opinion*, as well as by the change in that of *property*. Let kings recollect, that although the vulgar confound *royalty* with *monarchy*, as one and the same, they are in fact only mere relations; although of one family, they are different branches. *Monarchy*, the elder, the obnoxious branch, may, and ought to become extinct; while *royalty*, the younger, adopting new principles, and acting with wisdom, justice, temper, and frankness, has nothing to fear; but may survive the change of balance, and flourish.

7th. From the internal evidence of the work now under consideration, *The Art of Law-giving*, published in 1659, I incline to an opinion, that *Harrington* at that time wished he had given his great work, the *Oceana*, a less learned garb; that he had adapted his offices and titles more to the customs and habits of Englishmen; and that, as a matter of expediency, in drawing up that system of government for the adoption of *Cromwell*, he had proposed for the chief magistrate an hereditary king: and I also incline to imagine. that, had this been part of the plan, *Harrington's* Commonwealth had at this day been the Constitution of *England*, and the house of *Cromwell* on the throne.

'Tis certainly remarkable, that after having so carefully guarded, in his original work, against an hereditary throne, he should here make all these acknowledgments in its favour; that, had *Elizabeth* seen deep enough into the science of legislation, to have framed a well-ordered commonwealth, hereditary *royalty* "might have remained," consistently "with the full perfection of the orders requisite to "popular government;" and not only so, but "with "dignity and revenue to the full, both *improved* and "discharged of all envy;" that the people, once seeing and experiencing its blessings, would not agree "to quit such a government," calculated to bestow on them as "perfect felicity" as it is in the power of
"human

"human nature to enjoy." And he that, at this fearful moment of prejudice and passion between royalty and republicanism, can calm the opponents, by shewing both parties the unreasonableness of their mutual fears, and can persuade them to embrace with kindness and cordiality, will surely deserve the title of a friend to his country.

8th. This last remark, that *without a due consideration of the balance as it now stands in England, no effectual settlement can be made; and that a settlement requires the superstructures NATURAL to popular government*, appears so clear in itself, and so fraught with wisdom, that, were they not the words of so great a man as *Harrington*, they must yet command our assent. Now, in order to comprehend their full scope, we must not only imbibe the author's elevated sentiments, respecting the effects of republican government; and the dignity of mind produced in a Commonwealth; but we ought to ponder on his prophetic declaration, that in our day "*the sick would not be able to withstand the sound, nor the sound to preserve their health, without curing of the sick;*" and to mark its extraordinary progress towards fulfilment, by means of that mighty engine, *opinion*, which now threatens with early extinction all royalty and all nobility, not interwoven, with the consent of the people, into truly popular governments. It seems, therefore,

therefore, time, while we talk about repairing the foundations of our liberties in the House of Commons, to consider also how to place and secure the superstructures of royalty and nobility, as orders in our Commonwealth both ornamental and useful.

Monarchy and aristocracy have been described as *vipers already writhing under the grasp of infant democracy*. In my mind, there is more happiness in this figure, than the author of it was probably aware of. In the viper, there are other distinguishing properties besides *poison*. When monarchy and aristocracy have so much overbearing preponderancy, that they can play the tyrant, then deadly is their *poison* to the life of freedom; but so restrained as to prevent this effect, they may afford it *nourishment* and *medicine*. “It will be convenient in this
“place,” to use the words of the sage and amiable *Harrington*, “to speak a word to such as go about
“to insinuate to the nobility or gentry a fear of
“the people, or to the people a fear of the nobility
“or gentry, as if their interests were destructive
“to each other; when indeed an army may as
“well consist of soldiers without officers, or of
“officers without soldiers, as a Commonwealth
“(especially such a one as is capable of greatness)
“of a people without a gentry, or a gentry without
“a people.”

How,

How, then, are we to guard the Commonwealth against the *poison*, and to secure to it the *nourishment* and *medicine*, that is, the *wisdom* and *goodness*, of monarchy and aristocracy?—The means are obvious.—Arm the people to the full extent of property, that is, down to every taxed householder: cause them to be equally, fully, and effectively represented in annual parliaments: exchange the word *kingdom*, for that of *commonwealth*; and accommodate to that wise and salutary exchange, *the whole language and law of the state*. By these simple means, *royalty*, with its appendage *nobility*, being discharged of “envy,” will remain in safety; and *liberty*, without abolishing ranks, violating rights, disturbing the public tranquillity, or even shaking any more respectable prejudice, than that of a herald, an antiquary, or an old woman, will be fixed on foundations as durable as the race of man.

It is not on slight grounds I propose an attention to *words*. Words govern public opinion; as both the wise and the wicked know full well. It is for this reason that knaves are perpetually misleading mankind, by an artful misuse and perversion of words; while such men as *Aristotle*, *Bacon*, *Locke*, and *Tooke* have laboured, (nor has it been the slightest of their labours) to guard society against the mischief. “I am apt to imagine,” says *Locke*,
“that

“ that were the imperfections of language, as the
“ instrument of knowledge, more thoroughly
“ weighed, a great many of the controversies that
“ make such a noise in the world would of them-
“ selves cease, and the way to knowledge, and
“ perhaps peace too; lie a great deal opener than
“ it does.” See *Tooke's Diversions of Purley*, for
this subject at large.

Having thus finished my observations on this chapter of *Harrington*, so applicable to the healing measure I recommend; of calling our government by *name*, what we know it to be in *fact*, a COMMONWEALTH, let me explain the propriety of accommodating our language and our law to this just, this necessary, this important distinction; a want of attention to which has too long caused much inconsistency, much confusion of ideas, and much mischief. Our present *legal* language, as well as what may be called our *language of state*, seems almost wholly derived from the idea of living under a *monarchy*, and were fit only for such an arbitrary system. Towards the king, it is a language of falsehood and servile adulation, disgraceful to a free nation: towards the people, it is humiliating and degrading. It is a language which, if a king be not more than mortal, must poison his mind with despotic ideas; and implant in it prejudices against the liberties of the people, which no infor-
mation,

mation, no advice, no experience, can ever eradicate. All the lawyers and all their books, by monstrous fictions grounded on the pretensions of feudal tyrants, suppose the king to be sole proprietor of all our lands, the sole source of all our laws, and sovereign lord of all things and all persons, in *his Majesty's* dominions.

Hence all writs run in the king's name; no man kills a hare on his own manor, but under an authority supposed to flow from the grace and favour of the *monarch*, as Lord Paramount of all manors; and if, while his Majesty is botanizing at *Kew*, or amusing himself with cards at *Windsor*, two fishwives pull caps at *Billingsgate*, and cause a fray in the street, it is "against the peace of our sovereign lord the king, his crown and dignity."—Nay; the *state*, forsooth has no "collected will;" the millions do not even make our legislative acts;—it is the king only who *enacts*, in and to which, indeed, the lords and commons *advise* and *assent*; and in the tail of the paragraph, I suppose by way of a little flattery, there is a bare admission of their having some *joint authority* in the proceeding.*

Would

* In the reign of Charles II. it was enacted, that a former "Act for preventing inconveniences, happening by *the long intermission* of parliaments, is in derogation of his Majesty's *just rights and prerogative, inherent to the imperial crown of this* realm,"

Would it not run full as well to say, 'Be it therefore enacted by the people of this Commonwealth in Parliament assembled, with the counsel and assent of the Lords of Parliament and his Majesty, and by the sovereign authority of the same.'—If a people are to make their own laws by their *power*, counselled by the *wisdom* of their nobles, and those laws to be assented ‡ to and ex-

K

ecuted

"*realm*, for the calling and assembling of parliaments," &c. the whole of the said act repealed, "annulled and utterly made void."—"and because, by the antient laws and statutes of this realm, made in the reign of king Edward III. parliaments are to be held *very often*, your Majesty's humble and loyal subjects *most humbly* do beseech your *most excellent* Majesty," [a secret pensioner to Louis XIV. and a profligate betrayer of the interest of his country] "that, hereafter, the sitting and holding of parliaments shall not be *intermitted* or discontinued above *three years* at the most," &c.

It being at this time by 4 Ed. III. c. 14. *the law of the land*, "that a parliament shall be holden *every year once, and more often if need be*," where was this "prerogative inherent in the imperial crown," to call and assemble parliaments at its own good pleasure, but in the lying assertion of these base and infamous men!

† This form need not prevent bills originating in the great council of the Lords.

‡ In the Constitution of Pennsylvania, the chief magistrate who *executes* the laws, has no participation whatever in *making* them; which seems to arise from a correct idea of free government. But having in our constitution a king, accustomed to have a voice, it would be an illiberal insult to exclude him in future,

ecuted by the *goodness* of the first magistrate, this, surely, is the language of propriety and reason; and the only language becoming the dignity of a free nation.

The writer, in thus labouring to get rid of *words*, and *phrases*, and *absurd forms of proceeding*, relative to the constitutional *connection* between the people of *England* and their king, which have not only widely propagated the most pernicious errors respecting our constitution, but have produced practical evil of great magnitude, and of the most fatal consequences; has but too much reason to fear that he shall experience the same inattention of a thoughtless public to what he *now* says, as he experienced in 1775, as heretofore mentioned,* when he laboured on exactly the same kind of ground, to expose the erroneous notions which then prevailed, respecting the *connection* between this country and her colonies; and when he recommended, as now he does, A MEASURE OF RECONCILIATION, sanctioned by every principle of our

future. Nay, I should even approve of his being able to say on the first presentment of a Bill, 'The king recommends a reconsideration;'—and on a second presentment, 'The king is advised to withhold his assent.'—But in this last case, his Majesty in council should state his objections, and send them to the *House of Commons*. If those objections should not cause the House to alter the Bill, then, on being again presented, the royal assent should be given.

* P. 53.

constitution, every motive of policy and humanity, and every precept of religion and morality; which in times of civil dissention and party violence must prompt every good man to prevent, if possible, the effusion of human blood and national calamity. Foreseeing, and foretelling, that the dispute with the colonies must terminate in their independence, and perceiving on examination of the question that such independence was their *right*, and our *interest*, he, regardless of public prejudice when supported by truth, reasoned with his infatuated countrymen, and recommended, on all the motives of that important case, an admission of legislative independence; on terms that *would not have lost Britain the seamen of America in time of war*. His country listened not: she spilt her blood: she annihilated a property of *two hundred and fifty millions sterling*;* she lost the seamen for ever; and after a civil war of seven years she was glad to court peace at the hands of *Independent America*.

Was prejudice stronger in that day than in this? The antipathy between *American* and *Englishman* was faint to that between *Republican* and *Royalist*: and *unconditional submission* was mild, compared with *extermination*. Where, then, is the hope that

* See p. 53. The present loss of seamen by the total separation is supposed to be 35 or 40,000; an object of immense consideration.

the calm, impartial voice of constitutional truth, to which then none would listen, should now obtain a candid hearing ! That, however, is the concern of those to whom it is addressed. The writer has discharged the duty of a citizen watchful of his country's good. If he deceive not himself, he has shewn the king, the noble, and the republican, means the most constitutional, simple and easy, by which all their separate fears may be dissipated, all their jealousies dismissed, all their differences reconciled, all their interests united ; and the common peace, prosperity, glory and happiness, on grounds of reconciliation, promoted and secured.

Less than what he has done, he could not reconcile to his own mind, when he contemplated the awful situation of his country and of *Europe* ; and the stupendous dispensations of Providence which are so evidently operating a great change in the condition of the human race ; preparing them by means of political reformation for the great moral reformation which is to follow. At such a period, —a period when all court policy is baffled by the ground it stands on sinking under it ; —a period when all arbitrary governments, by the insatiation of exhausting themselves in a contest which is the very means of enlightening their miserable subjects, are opening the eyes of the people to their own condition, of sheep led to the slaughter for the profit of their lords ; —a period when the subalterns also of

2

despotism

despotism are provoking their own downfall, by the rancour of their spirit and the egregious folly of their conduct; a period when the triumphs and the energies of republicanism on both sides the *Atlantic*, proclaim it to be the species of government for every one who prefers the dignity of being a citizen to the debasement of being a subject; —and a period to which the finger of divine prophecy more than seventeen hundred years ago distinctly pointed, as to a time of awful events; and, in countries of *great political depravity*, but two probably, of *a new chaos and a new creation*, as, in one instance, we have already seen.

At a period of such impressions as these, it becomes a thinking man, who believes a moral government of the world, to look into his own bosom, and to ask himself if in such a season he will venture on any political step, of the moral rectitude of which he shall not be satisfied; if he can meet with fortitude those public calamities which seem impending; and if he be prepared to render an account of his share in transactions, upon which the future fate of his country shall depend.

To his Majesty and the nobles of the land, the writer particularly and most earnestly recommends a dispassionate consideration of what he has offered. In advising them for their welfare, they have this

ground for confiding in his sincerity, that he has not been in the habit of courting their smiles, nor of flattering their passions. Under their own roofs, he wishes them advisers equally faithful; and equally solicitous to point out to them the things that belong to their peace, their interest and their honour.

Should the tri-coloured flag once fly on the Tower of *London*, from that moment, whatever might be the fate of the people, the privileges of nobility and the regal office must be annihilated. But consequences still more serious might be found in the train of such an event. By a conquest of this island, not only the British navy would be added to the marine of *France*; but *Ireland* also must fall; and the British empire in *Asia* and the *West Indies* be transferred to the conquerors; then truly possessing the dominion of the sea from pole to pole. Tell me not, that, with such prizes to contend for,—prizes which the conquest of this island gives at once,—*France* will attack you at a distance and in detail!—No: If you put not instantly on the complete armour of representation, and wield not the potent sword of a Saxon militia, you are a subdued people! Success in this enterprize would satisfy the great ambition of *France*. By making and occupying such conquests, she would be disburthened of armies too numerous to be received
back

back into her bosom: and the Convention, crowned with glory, and enjoying the full confidence of their constituents, would then have an opportunity of closing their revolutionary labours, by giving a lasting constitution and repose to their country.

When we see temptations so irresistible set before a fiery, ambitious, ardent people, who are not only embittered towards *England*, by a rankling recollection of successive mortifications, from the days of *Edward III.* to those of *George III.*; but are stung with a sleepless revenge for *England's* striking at their new-born liberty, and attempting to replant the tree of despotism in devastation and blood;—when, I say, we contemplate these mighty motives to such minds as now direct the counsels of *France*, are we, by suffering ourselves to be over-run, to expect such terms of fraternity and freedom, as the Savoyards, the Spaniards, the Flemings, the Brabanters, and the Dutch!—No: no: no! By fraternizing with those nations, *France* aims at a complete ascendancy in dominion. By fraternizing with *Britain*, that ascendancy would not be decisive; and we might still eclipse her glory in the east and in the west.—What have we, then, to expect, from being unable to resist the armies of *Pichegru*?—Not fraternity; but subjugation: not a participation with Frenchmen in freedom and

prosperity; but to be hewers of wood and drawers of water to unforgiving conquerors; and, in a groaning servitude, to expiate the crime of having yielded up our country to the pillage, and our liberties to the despotism of base Borough-holders. And is it at such a moment as this, that men demand—‘Would things be better if Parliament were a real representation of the people?’—That matters never will be bettered by such men—if men they deserve to be called—as ask the question, is most unquestionable. NATIONAL ENERGY being the thing wanted, from THE NATION it must be drawn.—It cannot be drawn from things in human form, that conceive not what the word *nation* means: it cannot be drawn from the leeches, the gorged and swollen blood-suckers, who are the immediate cause of national weakness and lassitude; and whose deleterious influence threatens a speedy death.—Order a muster of the HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR: Call them into your presence: Set the reptiles before your eyes: Take dimensions of their capacity: Estimate their worth in the day of trial: Ask them, if the maggots of corruption can conquer armies; or the worms of the dunghill defend a nation!!!—It were a muster and a scrutiny, from which you must turn with the deepest disgust; and contempt unutterable!—Good God! that Britain should be in such a state of debility and degradation, when she has to contend for her all! That she should,

should be doomed to have her counsels poisoned, her arm unnerved, her very heart alienated from her head, to cherish serpents and nourish corruption!—And is it at a moment so awful, and without one grievance respecting representation redressed, that Patriots proclaim to their astonished country, that they suspend, for the present, all proceedings on the subject of Parliamentary Reform!—Tell me, O Patriotism, have I not followed thee too far!—Art thou, indeed, ought that I can comprehend!

In hopes of having on the 14th of this month (February), reason to strike my pen through the foregoing allusion, this sheet was detained in the press; but to my great concern the passage must stand. As the society in question has not, like another assembly, its motions, debates and divisions reported to the public, its individual members have not those means of exculpation, when they may apprehend blame is likely to fall on the society. Being on the present occasion in this predicament, I feel it necessary to the justification of my own conduct, and to that place in public estimation which I wish to hold, to declare that the suspension appears to me, in every view of it, to be founded in error, and, at the present juncture, peculiarly wrong. I not only voted against it, but very early afterwards, assisted by Mr. Losh, Mr.

Mr. Clifford, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Maxwell, and Mr. Holt White, I drew up an Address to the Public, to be offered for the adoption of the society, assigning reasons why it was time to resume our proceedings; which address was so far approved by the Committee, that, together with a motion for reconsidering the measure of suspension, it was recommended to the society to adopt an address of the same purport; and for the purpose of discussing these questions, the Committee called an Extraordinary General Meeting of the Society. At that meeting, held on the 14th, a motion to resume our proceedings was made by myself, and seconded by Mr. Rutt; and in my judgment, the arguments of that gentleman, of Mr. Gurney, and Mr. Clifford, who supported the motion, were unanswerable. But we lost the question by a division of 39 against 16; after which the society adjourned for THREE MONTHS.

Those three months ought, surely, to have been otherwise employed. Instead of so adjourning, the society in my opinion ought to have redoubled its zeal and activity; and to have employed the tranquil interval, during which we may expect to be secure from invasion, in such declarations, resolutions, and other proceedings, as should most effectually tend towards getting the state, at that awful period of the approaching storm, when our
i only

only alternative may be, a Reform or a Revolution, into the safe port of the Constitution. The following arguments for redoubling our efforts in the cause of Reform, are not, surely to be disregarded.

First, That nothing can so effectually dispose the people of Great Britain, to exert themselves in defence of their country against invasion, as to give them such a stake and interest in the constitution, as a free people ought to possess,

That to extend the Elective Franchise to all Householders paying taxes; to equalize the representation; and to establish annual elections are necessary.

That, as a substantial Reform of the House of Commons might be effected by the provisions of a single statute, so neither an actual invasion, nor other cause of public alarm, or confusion, which should not necessarily prevent the sitting of Parliament, and the execution of the laws, can at any time furnish a just pretence, for postponing a measure so essential to the preservation of the constitution, as giving the people that representation in the legislature which is their right.

That

That in case the calamitous situation of the country should render a permanent sitting of Parliament necessary or expedient, it might be provided in the Act for effecting the proposed Reform, that the new Representatives, to be first chosen under that Act, should be elected during the continuance and sitting of the present parliament; and that the present parliament should not be dissolved until such new Representatives were ready to enter upon their functions.

That the disinclination of the people of the Netherlands and Holland to defend their respective countries against the French, must be attributed to the want of an identity of interest, and community of feeling, with those in whose hands the legislative and executive functions of their governments were placed;—to that certain, though perhaps secret, hostility, which must ever subsist between oppressors and the oppressed.

That the impression made upon the people of Brabant, by the offer of the *joyeuse entrée* on the part of the Emperor's government, when obliged to retire before the approaching armies of France, is an instructive example to our Borough-holders, that *reform may be offered too late*.

That

That the same may also be true of *arms*, has been shewn by the conduct of the Dutch. When called upon without any offer to them of true political liberty, to rise in a mass; and when offered those arms of which they had before been denied the use; in silent and sullen disdain, they refused even to fight for their country.

That a substantial Reformation in the House of Commons, and a revival of the Saxon Militia, including every Householder, are the best, and apparently the only means, of obtaining an honourable and secure peace.

That supposing the ministry of this country to consist of honest men who saw the necessity of a substantial Reformation in the House of Commons; who stood pledged to contend for it; and who should accordingly exert themselves to the utmost, as men and as ministers, in an effort to obtain it; but should find the corrupt interests of the Borough-mongers, too powerful for their united strength; there cannot, as I must think, be a proposition more plain, than that such ministers must instantly resign their situations; assigning to the king and to the people, in the manly language of patriotism, their reasons for so doing: for it would be impossible that such men could consent passively to administer the government, under the indirect and
dark,

dark, but absolute controul, of an infamous, plundering faction; the very existence of which faction, would be a proof that an odious tyranny had overturned the constitution; and to continue in office under such a faction, would be voluntarily to partake of its criminality, and to co-operate with it, in rendering a recovery of the constitution impracticable. That to fall into the fatal error of compromising with the Borough-mongers, for leaving them a portion of their present patronage, or corrupt influence; would be in effect to conspire with them against the rights of the people; and to leave a leaven in the dough of representation, by which the whole mass might again be infected, to the utter subversion of our liberties.

That for the reasons last assigned, every possible effort, previous to a change of ministry, ought to be exerted, to weaken the faction of Borough-mongers; by exposing them, in repeated petitions to parliament, in resolutions of patriotic societies, in writing and in conversation, to the contempt and detestation of mankind, as the real authors of all national calamity, and as the most deadly enemies to their country.

That by thus actively labouring to the last moment of tranquillity, to tear away the veil of influence from before the Borough-mongers, and
to

to inform the people of the *true cause* of all national misfortunes, their exertions, when once called forth, might be successfully directed to the *true remedy*, a Reform in the Commons House of Parliament; for if the people have not already the necessary conviction to this end, it is plain that more instruction is wanting; and to what the distraction of their uninstructed minds may lead them, when the day of invasion and confusion may come, is an awful consideration for those who *might have led them into the paths of the constitution.*

T H E E N D .

APPENDIX.

✓

to the first book of the law of the Lord
and the second book of the law of the Lord
and the third book of the law of the Lord
and the fourth book of the law of the Lord
and the fifth book of the law of the Lord
and the sixth book of the law of the Lord
and the seventh book of the law of the Lord
and the eighth book of the law of the Lord
and the ninth book of the law of the Lord
and the tenth book of the law of the Lord

7
THE END

A P P E N D I X.

No. I.

*For the great Constitutional Right and Duty,
as well as the Wisdom and the Necessity of
being ARMED for Defence of the Peace, the
Laws and the Liberties of our Country, see
the following Authorities and Arguments.**

“**Y**OU that be Lieutenants and Gentlemen
of Command in your counties, I require
you to take care *that the people be well ARMED,*
and in readines upon all occasions.” [Q. Elizabeth to both Houses of Parliament.]

“It is the duty of all free men to have arms;”
[De Laud. Leg. Angl. c. 44.] “Arms of defence and peace;” [Bracton, lib. iv. c. 4.]
“Under Peril of *Fine*,” [N. Bacon, p. 64.
33 Hen. viii. c. 9.] “And not only to be
armed, but to be *expert in arms*.” [33 Hen.

* Copied from the Copper-plate Declaration of Rights, now sold by W. Sharp, Engraver, Charles-street, Middlesex hospital.

viii. c. 9. Free Militia, p. 14, 18. Legal Mode of suppressing Riots, p. 13.]

“ The common and statute laws of the realm,
 “ *in force at this day*, give the *civil* state in every
 “ county a power, which, if it were perfectly un-
 “ derstood, and continually prepared, would ef-
 “ fectually quell any riot or insurrection, without
 “ assistance from the *military*, and even without the
 “ modern riot-act.”—“ Since the *musket* and *bayonet*
 “ are found by experience to be the most effectual
 “ arms, all persons, who constitute the power of
 “ a county, are bound to be competently skilled
 “ in the use of them.”—“ And since the only safe
 “ and certain mode of using them with effect is by
 “ acting *in a body*, it is the duty of the whole civil
 “ State to know the platoon exercise, and to learn
 “ it in companies.” [Legal Mode of suppressing
 Riots, p. 5, 13.]

“ The defence of the Constitution was in *the*
 “ *People* at large.” [Dobbs on Volunteers, p. 8.]

“ The custom of the nation has been to train up
 “ the freeholders to discipline.” [Aland’s De
 Laud. Leg. Angl. c. 44.]

“ No nation ever kept up an *army* in times of
 “ peace, which did not *lose its liberties*.” [Polit.
 Disq. Vol. II. 349.]

“ No

“ No kingdom can be secured, otherwise than
“ by arming *the People*. The possession of ARMS
“ is the distinction between a *freeman* and a *slave*.”
[Fletcher, 307. Pol. Disq. Vol. II. 390.]

Had the Londoners but uniformly acted upon the above principles of constitutional defence, their property and habitations, in June 1780, instead of being at the mercy of an abandoned and contemptible mob, had been in perfect quiet and security; that mob had not spread terror and dismay wherever it bent its licentious course, nor wrapt in flames whatever became the object of its capricious fury.

And had the inhabitants in general on that occasion assembled in *armed Companies* and defended their city, as their duty required, the just sentence of offended law had not since levied on them its FINES, in punishment of their disgraceful negligence for suffering individuals to be pillaged and their houses to be burnt at noon day, chapels to be violated, and prisons to be broken down, and the residence and property of millions to be threatened with one common and instant ruin; as though it were a city without laws, without magistrates, without citizens; where every thing was deserted and given up as a spoil to the most brutish and senseless destroyers that ever trampled order, jus-

tice, and humanity under foot. Good God! Can the inhabitants of London recal this scene of horror and anarchy to their minds, and yet neglect to form armed Associations in every ward, in every parish, in every street!

Nor is the *property* of the unarmed less insecure than their domestic government and civil liberties. For, if a people, through an unaccountable supineness and infatuation, will altogether abandon the possession and use of arms to a mercenary army, that army in time of war will be subject to a defeat, which, *if none else be armed*, may in one instant transfer the government to a foreign invader; as actually happened to our ancestors, when King Harold was defeated at Hastings, and William the Norman, *by a single battle*, became at once the conqueror and the tyrant of England.

With this instructive event before our eyes, at a time when we know not how soon it may be the turn of England herself to be the theatre of a war, originating in pride, injustice, and want of wisdom;—with the horrors of a burning capital still fresh in every mind, while no resort has yet been had to effectual measures of future prevention;—with the recollection how insidiously designing ministers suffered every ancient law for arming the inhabitants at large to fall into disuse and forgetfulness,

fulness, while a military power, abhorrent to our laws and constitution, was constantly kept to overawe us, and made on too many occasions a shocking instrument for enforcing the civil authority;—and with the evidence also of a seven years bloody contest for establishing in America *taxation without representation*, to convince us that there is no principle of the constitution, however sacred, which a mere army will ever regard;—with all these awful warnings before our eyes, it is to be hoped we shall no longer neglect the indispensable duty of arming in defence of all that is dear to us, or that can be dear to our posterity; that our representatives will no longer neglect to adapt the ancient arming laws to the weapons now in use: that men of rank, fortune, and public spirit, will no longer delay to promote armed associations, at a time when those constitutional Statesmen who now preside over our affairs, like the wise ministers of the immortal Elizabeth, encourage a system of national defence most agreeable to the genius of our free government; a system which, while it should give internal security to our island, would hereafter enable those ministers to retrench from the present expence of internal defence, in order to augment our external bulwark the NAVY.

June, 1782.

No. II.

To the HOLLAND FEN Farmers.

*Plain Truths for Plain Men.**

IF a quicker increase of tillage than of population in these parts oblige you to give extra wages, you must allow the strangers who come to reap your harvest, in addition to the fair wages of *adjoining* counties, enough to defray their expences out and home, besides something for risk of not getting work, or of not being fully employed. *If the market for wages be kept fairly open*, this probably would not ever exceed *70 per cent.* upon the wages of adjoining counties; but that alone is a great burthen; in general it would be less, and yet content the labourers who resort to you. Wages, it is true, like any other marketable commodity, will fluctuate. A deficiency of hands in the market, or a sudden ripening of your harvests, would raise them; a medium supply of hands and a gradual ripening would keep them stationary; and a superfluity of hands at any time would lower them. Thus, both to master and servant, one year's loss would balance another year's gain. At

* Published and distributed in 1791, in consequence of an insurrection.

present,

present, an harvest day's labour in *Nottinghamshire*, (an adjoining county and a county of *manufacture*) including *allowance*, does not exceed 1s. and 9d. or 2s. You are paying *four times* as much. Your lands upon an average so far from producing four times as much corn, do not yield more than an additional *fourth part*; while your *grain is inferior* and your *markets are lower*; not to observe, that rents are more regulated by the quality of land than the price of labour.

For this grievance you are indebted to a very few lawless men. Although the late disorders were timely repressed by the vigilance of your magistrates, yet the effects of these disorders you yet feel. The apprehension of purchasing employment at the hazard of their lives, has driven numbers of the *Irish* out of the country; and the rioters themselves have been obliged to leave unshorn those harvests they meant to have monopolized. Hence the present scarcity of hands, and most extravagant wages, when it is a notorious fact, that at the commencement of the season there were labourers in abundance.

Hence also certain Ale-house resolutions "Not to work more than three days a week, and not to work under twelve shillings a day." The unthinking combiners did not, however, find it practicable to

carry the latter part of their plan into execution—; how they proceeded upon the first, I am not informed. In *the present state of things*, I do not see any adequate means of preventing such abuses in future, which can only be effected by keeping strangers perfectly free from apprehensions of violence, and a market for labour fairly open. Do you expect that those, who have this year been driven away for fear of their lives, will come next season to cut your harvest? The danger of so doing comes *first*, when they are without defence. The magistrate's warrant, which comes lagging after the offender has escaped, will not cure their broken arms, their ripped bellies, or their fractured skulls. In such a state of things you will not, my friends, find the evil *temporary*: It will be the constant appendage to a Fen Farm. When neighbouring fens may be brought into tillage, *it will not be lessened*. In short, *it will continue as long as you continue in your present helpless condition*: a condition in which designing men will always be able to *raise alarms*, that will *raise wages*, without exposing themselves to the lash of the law.

But why, you may ask, do I give you this uncomfortable information, unless I have a remedy to propose? I am ready to answer your question. I will tell you the remedy. It is cheap, it is simple, it is in the performance of a duty absolutely

lutely required by the law of the land, and it is infallible. Put yourselves in a condition to preserve the peace, to give constant efficacy to those laws which without your assistance no magistrates can duly, fully, and completely enforce. Provide arms for yourselves and families. If the magistrate should then have occasion for your assistance, you are prepared to attend him and support him as the law requires. One musket and a bayonet in defence of peace and law, is a match for scores of scythes in the hands of men conscious of criminality. When each Farmer is known to have arms for himself, and for two or three or more trusty persons, and all are ready on the least alarm to defend themselves and neighbours, there will be no bullying any one out of the profits of his harvest, and the idea of mob-law will become ridiculous.

Riots, my friends, are a disgrace to any country inhabited by civilized men. Originating in the folly and wickedness of a few lawless persons, their beginnings are small; but who can tell where they will end? And who can restore to the community, property once destroyed, or lives once lost?

I have told you that it is your *duty* to provide arms. It is to be found not only in our law books, but in our acts of parliament, which unhappily for the peace of the kingdom are suffered to lie unread
and

and forgotten. But the reason of the thing, and your own knowledge of facts, will convince you that I am right. You know that it is the duty of the magistrates to support the laws, and, when necessity requires, to appear personally for suppressing riots. You know that every man is bound to obey their summons, and aid them in the execution of that duty. But how, if resistance be made, are you to repel rioters provided with clubs, scythes, and pitch-forks, if not provided with suitable arms? Muskets and bayonets being the *best* arms, it would be folly to provide any other. These same muskets will not be useless in other respects. They will defend your houses from the nightly robber, and your corn from the vermin that devour it.

You remember the mischiefs done by rioters when this Fen was first inclosed. Don't you recollect that the sufferers sued the *Hundred*, and recovered their damages? The laws of *England* do not punish where there is no crime. But the *Hundred*, convicted of the *crime* of not defending the peace and the common property of its inhabitants, *for which in such cases it is answerable*, was punished by a *fine* equal to the damages sustained, and that fine was levied upon it accordingly. Can you imagine that when your property is endangered, the Magistrate only is to risk his life in defending it? or do you suppose that it is the business of the army, and that you are not at all concerned
in

in the matter? Before the property of the nation can by an army be effectually preserved in security, (*by which I mean insured against the possibility of riotous depredation*) there must be an army sufficient to eat that property up. An army, when the mischief is done, can *quell* riots, but an armed Yeomanry only can *prevent* them. While soldiers are quartered at *York*, rioters raze to the ground the houses of Magistrates at *Sheffield*. While soldiers are stationed at *Nottingham*, rioters set *Birmingham* in flames.* This is the sort of security afforded to the

* *The following is an extract from Mr. YOUNG's Tour through Warwickshire, &c.*

“ Seeing, as I passed, a house in ruins, on enquiry I found it was Dr. Priestley's; I alighted from my horse, and walked over the ruins of that laboratory, which I had left home with the expectation of reaping instruction in—of that laboratory, the labours of which have not only illuminated mankind, but enlarged the sphere of science itself; which has carried its master's fame to the remotest corners of the civilised world; and will now, with equal celerity, convey the infamy of its destruction to the disgrace of the age, and the scandal of the British name. The close of the eighteenth century, the period for giving lectures of high church and Sacheverel, passive obedience, non-resistance, and the sovereign efficacy to the hardware of Birmingham, of mitred fronts in courts and parliaments! These are the *pulpit* principles that have scrawled *Church and King* on all the barns and stables that I pass. These are the principles that instigated a mob of miscreants—I beg pardon

the property and peace of those who rely upon *others* to defend them, while they shamefully desert that great law of nature, self-defence; and that fundamental law of the land, *the support of the civil Magistrate in defence of the peace*. This, my friends, is plain common sense, and is at least as old as the gospel; where we read, that, "When a strong man *armed* keepeth his house, his goods are in peace."—If you wish to follow my advice, don't defer it till next harvest. A good resolution *deferred*, is in great danger of being forgotten. The way to have *Irish* labourers *next year*, is to carry this plan into *immediate* execution; that those now in the country may carry home the intelligence, and know that they may return to your assistance in security. It is therefore recommended to you to consult together *this very day*, and each man to subscribe for the purchase of as many muskets as he shall choose for himself and family. The larger your order, the cheaper will be your arms. Circu-

pardon—of Friends and *Fellow Churchmen*, attached to Church and King,* to act so well for the reputation of this country."

* "Called so in an address to the mob, while engaged in their plunderings and burnings, in the same hand-bill that speaks of the *King's laws*. May not that address be translated into plainer English?—*You are a set of honest fellows, engaged in a good cause—which, however, you have pushed a little too far!* What a miracle after that the whole town was not plundered and burnt!"

late

late this paper from neighbour to neighbour, and from market to market. The more general, the greater will be the security; and that is a good reason for meetings and common consultations on the business. But in a duty which every man owes to himself, to the community and to the laws, no one needs wait to know what his neighbour means to do. I conclude with proposing a first meeting *this afternoon* at four o'clock, at the *White Hart Inn*.*

YOUR FRIEND,

A FARMER.

BOSTON,

31st of August, 1791.

No. III.

Letter to his Grace the Duke of Richmond.

MY LORD,

IT is long since I have offered your Grace any of my thoughts. Of late, I have some times inclined so to do; but have been restrained through an apprehension that they might not be acceptable. But a letter from on board the Hulks to the Editor of the Cambridge Chronicle, dated the 3d instant, which I have this instant read, bears down all re-

* A meeting was held and an association formed; which co-operating with active magistrates, the best effects have been experienced.

luctance,

luctance. Could I peruse that letter without the most poignant emotions, and without attempting to move those who have power to wipe out such a stain to humanity and to manhood as that letter affixes on my country, I should merit detestation. Read the letter, my Lord, I beseech you; and read also the trial of the writer. If he merit the treatment he has received, I also, and your Grace, ought to be cast into dungeons amongst felons. But if he be the virtuous victim of that corrupt and arbitrary system which your Grace and I have laboured to reform——It is needless to say more.

I am,

Your Grace's well-wisher,

JOHN CARTWRIGHT.

Brothertoft Farm,

Dec. 11, 1793.



ERRATA.

Page. Line from Top
or Bottom.

x	6	B	{ for join in r. attempt
xxxix	7	T	r. succession, as in
lxxi	3	B	r. Thomas Hardy
lxxx	8	T	r. Thomas Hardy
3	3	T	r. Nothing <i>modern</i> can resist its power :
5	3	B	r. 1789, amended on experience, would
21	11	B	r. the court inventions
25	7	T	r. To those
41	8	T	r. Peace
42	16	T	r. nor the
43	3	B	r. breast
56	8	T	r. <i>West</i>
60	8	T	r. pace
64	8	B	r and when again
67	14	B	r. rendered
68	15	T	r. state, than the specific crime which
80	12	B	r. gentleman
—	last		r. Majesty shall dare to
87	11	B	r. principle
95	3	T	r. latent
105	11	T	r. work
	6	B	{ for an alteration is r. measures are
112	6	T	r. and in
—	last		r. experience." (4)
122	14	T	r. hold
125	5	T	r. ornamental

